FAMILY LIFE TO-DAY

An expert and stimulating study by outstanding authorities of the problems that confront family life and of plans for its enrichment

CONTRIBUTORS

Karl de Schweinitz
Herbert Jennings
William F. Ogburn
Ernest R. Groves
Dorothy Canfield Fisher
Mary E. Richmond
Mrs. John M. Glenn
and others

Edited by

MARGARET E. RICH

$2.50

RICHARD C. CABOT

In medical circles, Dr. Cabot is known as one of America's most brilliant physicians; by social workers he is regarded as the pioneer and foremost figure in the new science of medical social service; and among the general public he is celebrated as the author of 'What Men Live By,' one of the most successful and illuminating of American books on the art of life; and of other notable works.

BOOKS BY DR. CABOT

SOCIAL WORK

Essays on the Meeting Ground of Doctor and Social Worker.

A LAYMAN'S HANDBOOK OF MEDICINE

With Special Reference to Social Workers.

WHAT MEN LIVE BY

Work, Play, Love, Worship.

PRESCRIPTIONS

A Collection of Extracts from 'What Men Live By,' compiled by Edith Motter Lamb.

FAMILY LIFE TO-DAY

REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON, MASS.
Archive
Collection

This book may not leave the Offices
and if borrowed must be returned within 7 days

FAMILY LIFE TO-DAY

FAMILY LIFE TO-DAY

PAPERS PRESENTED AT A CONFERENCE IN CELEBRATION OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FAMILY SOCIAL WORK IN AMERICA HELD AT BUFFALO, OCTOBER 2–5, 1927

EDITED BY

MARGARET E. RICH

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
The Riverside Press Cambridge
1928

COPYRIGHT, 1928, BY HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE · MASSACHUSETTS
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PREFACE

EVERY one has opinions about family life, few have facts. This volume gives the facts about family life to-day as seen by a group of leaders each of whom speaks from valuable first-hand experience.

The papers here presented were given at a three-day conference held October 2–5, 1927, at Buffalo, New York, under the auspices of the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the charity organization movement in this country. Buffalo was chosen as the meeting-place because it was there that the first Charity Organization Society was founded in 1877.

When the family social workers of the United States and Canada decided on the programme for their semi-centennial, they did an unusual thing. Instead of devoting their attention to an analysis of family social work as it has developed from the charity organization movement during the last half-century, they chose to consider family life in America to-day from the point of view, not only of family social work, but of other fields of human interest and effort.

The family touches all fields of human activity. It is the property, not of any one section of society, but of all its members. Its very closeness to each of us, the complexity of its relationships, have been serious obstacles to objective study and scientific research. Biologists, sociologists, ministers, teachers, social workers, and many others have written about the family from the angle of their specialties and have discussed it within their

own groups. The Buffalo meetings for the first time gave a cross-section of scientific thought representing many different points of view.

The programme brought together biologists, sociologists, educators, religious leaders, and students of society, each of whom was qualified to speak of the family authoritatively from the viewpoint of his particular interest. Their papers embody a consideration of the future of the family in America, not a purely conjectural future, but one based on what is actually happening to the family to-day through the effect of present-day institutions, fashions, amusements, and inventions.

It seemed, as the Conference at Buffalo proceeded, that the welfare of the family may well be a touchstone for evaluating the lasting worth of present-day industrial, educational, religious, and other social institutions. If it can be demonstrated that these institutions further a richer and more genuinely successful family life — not as we know family life all about us, but as it might become — then they satisfy one test of their own permanent value. The manner in which these institutions measure up to their opportunities and responsibilities will to a large degree determine the future of family life in America.

MARGARET E. RICH

CONTENTS

PART I

THE BACKGROUND

I. THE BIOLOGICAL BASIS OF THE FAMILY 3

HERBERT S. JENNINGS, *Baltimore, Maryland.* Professor of Zoölogy, Johns Hopkins University; recipient of Joseph Leidy Memorial Award; Author of 'Behavior of Lower Organisms,' 'Life and Death,' 'Heredity and Evolution in Unicellular Organisms,' 'Prometheus — Biology and the Advancement of Man.'

II. SOCIAL HERITAGE AND THE FAMILY 24

W. F. OGBURN, *Chicago, Illinois.* Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago; Editor, Journal American Statistical Association; Author of 'Progress and Uniformity in Child Labor Legislation,' 'Social Change,' and other books.

PART II

THE FOUNDING OF NEW FAMILIES

III. A CHALLENGE 43

DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER, *Arlington, Vermont.* Author of 'Mothers and Children,' 'The Bent Twig,' 'The Home-Maker,' 'Her Son's Wife,' and other books; former Member, State Board of Education, Vermont.

IV. EDUCATION FOR FAMILY LIFE 49

ERNEST R. GROVES, *Chapel Hill, North Carolina.* Professor of Sociology, University of North Carolina; Author of 'Wholesome Childhood,' 'The Drifting Home,' 'Social Problems of the Family,' 'Social Problems and Education,' and other books.

V. THE CONCERN OF THE COMMUNITY WITH MARRIAGE 58

MARY E. RICHMOND, *New York City.* Director, Charity Organization Department, Russell Sage Foundation; Author of 'Friendly Visiting Among the Poor,' 'The Good Neighbor in the Modern City,' 'Social Diagnosis,' 'What is Social Case Work?' 'Child Marriages' (in collaboration).

PART III

WORK, WAGES, AND LEISURE

VI. THE INTEGRITY OF THE FAMILY AS A TEST OF INDUSTRY 79

A. J. MUSTE, *Katonah, New York.* Chairman of Faculty, Instructor in History, Brookwood Labor College; Board of Editors of 'Labor Age' and 'The World To-morrow.'

VII. THE CHANGING BASIS OF FAMILY SUPPORT AND EXPENDITURE 102

PAUL H. DOUGLAS, *Chicago, Illinois.* Associate Professor of Industrial Relations, University of Chicago; Lecturer, Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women in Industry; Economic Adviser, Printing Trades, Chicago; Author of 'American Apprenticeship and Industrial Education,' 'The Worker in Economic Society,' Wages and the Family,' and other books.

VIII. TOWARD THE REDISCOVERY OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN INDUSTRY 118

DAVID C. ADIE, *Buffalo, New York.* General Secretary, Charity Organization Society of Buffalo; formerly Impartial Chairman, Men's and Boys' Clothing Industry, New York City.

IX. NEW TOOLS OF LEISURE 133

KARL DE SCHWEINITZ, *Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.* General Secretary, Family Society; Member of Faculty, Pennsylvania School of Social and Health Work; Author of 'The Art of Helping People Out of Trouble,' 'Growing Up.'

PART IV

OUTWARD AND INWARD MINISTRIES

X. THE FAMILY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOOD 161

FREDERICK MAY ELIOT, *St. Paul, Minnesota.* Minister Unity Church, St. Paul; Member, Board of Directors, United Charities of St. Paul; Author of 'The Unwrought Iron.'

XI. RELIGION AND FAMILY LIFE 181

RUFUS M. JONES, D.D., *Haverford, Pennsylvania.* Professor of Philosophy, Haverford College; Author of

'Spiritual Energies in Daily Life,' 'Religious Foundations,' 'Fundamental Ends of Life,' and other books.

PART V

FAMILY SOCIAL WORK LOOKS FORWARD AND BACK

XII. THE CONTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL CASE WORK TO MODERN LIFE 193

GORDON HAMILTON, *New York City*. Instructor in Social Case Work, New York School of Social Work, Associate Director of Social Service, Presbyterian Hospital, New York City.

XIII. THE DYNAMIC ASPECTS OF LIBERTY AND CONTROL 208

FRANK J. BRUNO, *St. Louis, Missouri*. Director, Department of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

XIV. THE FAMILY WELFARE MOVEMENT IN AMERICA 225

MARY WILLCOX GLENN, *New York City*. President, American Association for Organizing Family Social Work; President, National Council Church Mission of Help; Chairman, Committee on Social Case Work, International Conference of Social Work, Paris, July, 1928.

INDEX 241

FAMILY LIFE TO-DAY

∴

PART I

THE BACKGROUND

FAMILY LIFE TO-DAY

I

THE BIOLOGICAL BASIS OF THE FAMILY

HERBERT S. JENNINGS

NOTHING touching the family is foreign to biology, since biology is the science of the living. But conventionally, a biological treatment of man means that we are to look upon him as one animal among many and deal with matters that are common to him with the rest. We should not feel that such treatment is brutalizing. Man is gradually coming to the kindlier and happier attitude that all living things are brethren: with similar problems; with the same sort of deep-lying foundation for their activities. The biological basis of the family, therefore, is to be interpreted as its relation to the great underlying physiological processes; to development; to the interchange of matter and energy; to behavior; to reproduction. It is with this that I shall attempt to deal. It will not be my province to speak for or against the preservation or modification or abolition of the family as found in man, but only to show its relation to the central organic processes. This may aid in forming a judgment as to its function and value.

All organisms show two sets of activities that are to a certain extent in opposition. They live individually and they reproduce. Each individual has its own life career; it grows, develops, seeks and takes nutrition, pursues its varied business and desires, becomes mature; most organisms finally become old and die. And in addi-

tion each produces new individuals that shall take its place when its individual career is closed.

Now all organisms find — as human beings find and some loudly proclaim — that the business of reproduction interferes with their careers. The two things interact, intertwine, modify each other. This occurs differently in different organisms: there result many diverse systems, diverse institutions. Among these diverse systems is the family, in its various types and gradations, as we find it in man and in other animals. The number and variety of systems arising from the interaction of reproduction with the pursuit of the life career are so great as to defy enumeration. But an examination of certain typical situations will illustrate the rôle of the family.

The life career of some organisms is so simple and their reproduction is so simple that there is little interference. In some of my favorite pets, the rotifers, the individual simply drops here and there pieces of itself, which grow into new individuals. There is no mating and there is no further relation of parent with offspring. Yet even here the life career is somewhat modified; part of the parent's nutrition goes into these pieces, and their separation from the parent may be a severe operation.

And even in such cases the beginning of the family may appear. In some animals the piece or germ remains attached to the parent body, there growing and developing, feeding through the parent's mouth and sharing the parent's career. Several such offspring may remain attached to one parent; then we have a veritable incipient family, though with but one parent. A budding hydra, a colonial infusorian, shows us such an embryo family.

But animals that require two parents find the matter much more complex. Why most of us require not merely

one parent but two is one of the great and perhaps unanswered questions of biology. But certainly this increases enormously the variety and complexity of life; multiplies by thousands its problems and difficulties; perhaps also its interests and satisfactions. There is added to the life career the problem of finding and uniting with the mate; a problem much more difficult than that presented by the performance of most other functions. It requires specialized structures, specialized functions, specialized reactions. The seeking of the mate becomes one of the chief impulses changing the development and behavior of organisms, playing everywhere a tremendous rôle. It seems one of the chief bases of structural and mental evolution.

At its lowest, reproduction from two parents is still carried out in a relatively simple way. In some organisms the individuals simply cast their germ cells abroad, leaving them to unite or to fail, as chance may dictate; leaving the united product to develop as best it may. Such is the situation in many plants; in many aquatic animals. But as the life career becomes more complex, this does not suffice. The mates must seek and find each other. This becomes one of the main features of the life career. A difference arises between the two mates. One does most of the seeking, and carries minute germ cells that move and actively unite with those from the other mate. We call this the male. The other, the female, produces and carries large germ cells, in which she stores up food for the development of the young. Here appears the deepest duality of life, the difference of the sexes. The life career in both sexes is much altered by the mode of reproduction, but in the male far less than in the female. The production of the large germ cells, the storing of food

within them, the carrying of them, and their deposition — these things form for the female a large part of the business of life. The special problems of feminism begin far back in the animal series.

And this is but the first step in a long process. The life career of the female becomes still more profoundly altered when the egg, even after union with the germ cell from the male, remains attached to the body of the mother, receiving protection and nutrition, till a certain stage of development is reached. We find among animals all stages in this union. In some it goes but a little way. The female carries the egg merely till it is ready to hatch, then casts it abroad. In others the union becomes longer and more intimate, till we reach the condition found in the group to which man belongs, the mammals. Here the young is long identified with the parent. The new individual is not cast on its own resources until it has reached a rather advanced stage of development.

This intimate union for a long period of parent and offspring has large consequences. The development of the offspring is greatly changed. And the parent is modified hardly less; her entire physiology — metabolic, glandular, nervous, mental is tremendously influenced. In this union of parent and offspring we have another major factor in development and behavior comparable to that due to the requirement of mating. But this union affects directly but one of the parents, the female; the family at its beginning includes but mother and offspring. The male still retains his freedom, save for the mating requirements.

But the chain binding the male to his mate brings him, too, under the domination of the developing offspring. His mate is under a heavy handicap while carrying the

developing young. Her life career, so weighted down, becomes inadequate to nutrition and protection. The life career of the male, already greatly modified for the seeking of the female, becomes further changed toward retaining possession of her; toward feeding and protecting her while carrying and guarding the young. This situation we find widespread; in fishes, in birds, in mammals, the male protects and aids the female. The economic dependence of the female has begun.

Parallel with this we find another step. The wide-reaching influence of the young on the mother does not disappear at once on its separation from her body. It remains a source of reactions, an object of interest, after it has become free. The parent from which it has separated continues to protect it, to supply it food, to keep it under conditions favorable to its further development. Complex structures, complex activities arise in carrying out these functions. The life career is deeply modified. This becomes almost its chief *motif*. The mother wasp prepares food for the future young — a spider or larva that has been stupefied — deposits the eggs in this. The bird mother builds a nest, keeps the eggs warm, feeds the young. The family has now developed further, but in the simpler cases it still consists mainly of the offspring with but one of the two parents, the female.

But the male, too, becomes drawn into this work. The female and her behavior have become the strongest source of stimuli for the male. Her concern with the offspring must deeply influence him. At times his relation to the progeny appears but indirect. He protects the female; the progeny too are protected. In places it is more direct. The drawing of the life activities of the male into the circle of family life appears, as we survey

the animal kingdom, in curious, isolated, and unexpected ways. The male catfish of certain species takes the eggs in his mouth and there holds and protects them until the young can care for themselves. Certain male toads take the eggs on their backs and there carry them until the young animals hatch and escape. In various fish the male helps to build and guard the nest, and takes part in protecting the swimming young. Some male birds help build the nest; feed the female while she keeps the eggs warm; take their turn at that work; help to feed the young. In some mammals the male concerns himself little or hardly at all with these domestic matters; in others he plays an active rôle in providing a home and caring for the young.

Along with this intertwining of the life careers of parent and offspring, there come changes in the relation of the two parents to each other. In some animals the relation is but a passing one: the male seeks the female; then, after union of the germ cells, separates from her; they consort no more; and the next mating will be with another individual, or as chance may direct. But as the development of the young comes to be dependent on the parent or parents, as the parents feed, protect, and guide the young, the behavior of each parent becomes correlated with that of the other; they coöperate. The mating relation is continued between the same parents. We find here perhaps two main lines of evolution. In one group, typically, each male mates with a limited number of females, which he protects from enemies and defends from other males, incidentally protecting their young. The polygamous family has arisen: the herd or flock, headed by a single male, as in cattle, in seals, and in many mammals.

The polygamous family presents biological difficulties. Since in most species the number of males and females is approximately the same, the appropriation of several females by one male results in the exclusion of many males from propagation; results consequently in perpetual war among the males. Since in the nature of the case it is the more powerful warriors among the males that become parents of the next generation, this method of organization results in selective elimination in favor of the warlike; cuts out the pacifists, operates against the development of the virtues of peace, keeps society at war. As might be expected, in such polygamous families the males have little direct concern with the care of the young beyond the protection of the flock as a whole. Their business is mainly fighting and propagation.

But in those more numerous cases where the male becomes directly involved in the business of caring for the individual young produced by a particular mother, coöperation between a single male and a single female becomes the rule. Care of their common young keeps them together; the mating relation continues; successive children may be born to the same pair. What we usually think of as the family has come into existence: two parents and their offspring living together, carrying on their life careers in unison; sharing nutriment and protection; coöperating in activities. Such families are found in a great number of animals of diverse groups. They are by no means a peculiarly human institution.

The duration of the family relation depends much on the length of time that the young are so imperfect as to require assistance, and also, in a minor degree, on whether propagation is seasonal. In birds, in many mammals, mating occurs only at particular periods of

the year, and the young are dependent for but a short time; the family then remains a unit only for the same length of time. Then the parents separate from the children, and the two parents part, carrying on independent careers. In some cases, as in the pigeons, two successive broods of young overlap; the second one begins before the first has left the parents. In such cases the two parents remain mated, bringing up together two families of young. But at the end of the season they separate, each pursuing his own career, and at the next season each may enter into a family with a new mate.

But there exist or arise in many animals powerful biological influences that favor a coöperative career of the parents lasting for more than one season; or for life. The attraction of the mates for each other, combined with the effect of habit, itself acts powerfully in this direction. In the eagles, hawks, and other birds of prey, this keeps the mates together for life; a permanent monogamous marriage is here found. Successive families of young are produced, and though there intervene periods in which the parents are without young, the union of mates is for life.

In other animals this tendency toward a permanent cooperative life career on the part of the two parents is powerfully reënforced by the long period of dependence of the young. The development of the offspring to maturity requires not one season but many. The two parents, caring jointly for the young, remain together. The offspring come, not in broods, but singly. Succeeding children overlap in their developmental careers. There is no time when the two parents can separate without breaking in upon the functions they have undertaken in relation to the young. Such is the situation we find in the

higher anthropoids, the orang and the gorilla; such is the situation found at its highest development in man.

Meanwhile, too, the life career in such organisms has become full of complex activities of other sorts, requiring for their proper performance the undistracted attention of the individual, and all this is intertwined with the care, protection, and guidance of the young. To break the mating relation at any particular time is to bring all this into confusion; is to leave children and mate in distress; is to leave unfulfilled the mating impulse; is to force the separated mates anew into the intensely distracting pursuit of finding a new mate. All this is avoided by the mates remaining together. Even as age comes on, and the last of the offspring has taken up its own career, so that the biological relations with progeny no longer require coöperation on the part of the parents, long use and habit, the persistence of the need for companionship, keep together the two parents. Marriage is lifelong, even though the care of the offspring is not. Permanent monogamous marriage has arisen independently through similar functional requirements, in the mammals and in the birds; the biological needs giving origin to it being much the more numerous and powerful in the higher mammals. It is emphatically not true, as is so often asserted with assumed finality, that the only function of marriage is the production of children. On the contrary, marriage and the family are a complex resultant from the interaction of many functional needs. The satisfaction of the powerful mating impulse, one of the chief factors in organic evolution, reënforced as it is by many structural and functional complexes that have arisen in connection with it, is one of the major elements concerned. The thwarting of all that is connected with this impulse pro-

foundly affects and deranges the life career. No institution that leaves this function unfulfilled can be considered a biologically adequate one.

Such, then, is the family as we find it in monogamous birds and mammals, and in man: a life correlation, a union, of the careers of the two mates, and of both with the careers of the successive children till these are self-supporting. Its chief biological bases, in distinction from other systems found in organisms, are, in addition to the fundamental mating impulse and the production of young, the helplessness of the children at first, demanding parental support; the long time required for their development to the period of self-help; the marked handicapping of the female while the children are infantile; the lack in man of a seasonal period of mating and reproduction; the overlapping of the immature periods of the successive children; and the complexity of the individual life career, with the intertwining of its manifold activities with these reproductive relations. The monogamous family, with lifelong union of the mates, appears as the final term in a long evolutionary series.

As we examine the varied animal world we find another set of relations appearing, leading to a different culmination. Groups larger than a single monogamous family act together for support and protection. Indeed, the single family itself develops into such a group, when its members remain together after the progeny have themselves reached the period of mating. Still more readily is such a group formed from the polygamous family, of the male with many females; the herd protects itself and all its parts by common action. Society as a whole takes over many of the functions of the family. This situation, too, exists in man as a supplement to the monogamous family.

At a certain period before maturity the school takes over in certain relations the care of the young.

But this condition cannot readily reach its extreme development — society cannot fully supplant the family — in organisms where, as in mammals, there is a long-continued intimate union of offspring with parent, during which the child is brought to a considerably advanced state of development. Society cannot take over *this* parental function. And by that long and intimate union both parent and offspring are so fundamentally modified, in structural, physiological, and mental constitution, as to place great obstacles in the way of society's assuming control of the children even soon after birth.

It is in organisms not showing this intimate union of parent and offspring that we meet most highly developed this exercise by society as a whole of the functions taken elsewhere by the family; it is in certain of the insects that we find the culmination of this system. In these social insects the two parents play little part in life save in the production and bringing together of the germ cells. The life of the species — the individual life careers — are carried on by individuals that are not parents — non-sexual individuals. Such is the situation in some of the ants; in some of the bees, in termites. In social organization these, as William Morton Wheeler has brought out, have passed to a stage in evolution much beyond that of man; though whether for better or worse is another question; and it is another question, too, whether this is a line of evolution that man can or must follow.

In these ants and bees the functions of the parents have become purely propagatory; beyond this they have practically no life career. One female in the state is selected as mother. She is fostered and fed and protected

for the eggs she produces; the other females are destroyed or transformed by special treatment into non-sexual individuals. The males as such play a rôle only in that one of them fertilizes the single group mother; after one has done this, all other males may be destroyed; or in other cases they too are transformed, like the females, into neutral individuals. Society is non-sexual; carried on, not by husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, but by neuters. The whole distracting business of mating, or marrying and giving in marriage, is cut out of these societies; the individuals can apply themselves wholeheartedly to their life careers. The young produced by the group mother are cared for by certain of these neutral workers who make this their life business. The family does not exist; it is a state in evolution that has been left behind, transcended. The attainment of some such situation appears to be the aspiration of certain groups of men.

Such, then, are perhaps the chief types of situations that we find in the organisms as the working-out of the interactions of reproduction and the other business of the life career. One main line of development culminates in the monogamous family, as found in some birds, the higher anthropoids, and man; the other in the highly organized society without families, of the social insects.

When now we turn to a closer examination of the situation in man, we discover that here, as in so many other relations, man forms, either in concrete realization or in tendency and aspiration, a sort of abstract and brief chronicle of the entire biological series. In the main perhaps he represents the fully or incompletely developed monogamous family. But we find, too, scattered in the highly differentiated groups of mankind a number of the diverse phases that occur in the different groups of ani-

mals. Man cannot indeed go back to the phase of more isolated individuals; the mother at least is for a long time actually physically identified with the child; and even after the child has left her body she is held almost as powerfully united with it, though in a different way. But the male is in man as everywhere else less identified with the offspring; and there occur scattered individuals who tend to revert to the ancient type in which the males serve in the work of reproduction merely as fertilizers of the egg, leaving the rest of the work of the family to the female. These seem on the whole to be but sporadic throw-backs. Biologically they cannot be considered adequate members of society; at least not unless and until society becomes organized on some such plan as we find in the bees and ants, making the males largely superfluous. There exist species in which this otiose and incompetent condition of the males has developed far; in which (as in rotifers) the males are but a few short-lived dwarfs, without life career aside from propagation. It is not true, as recent magazine authors have asserted it to be, that the male must in the nature of things be more powerful and efficient than the female. On the contrary, in many animals the male is the weaker vessel, even rudimentary; to the point in some species of complete extinction, leaving the species to consist only of females. For in organisms in which there is sex, the female is indispensable while the male is not: the female can carry on the race alone, and does so.

More widely occurring in man than this tendency of the male to abdicate his rôle in the family are certain phases of partial development of the family. There exists in man the condition in which the single male possesses several or many females and acts as the head of the entire

complex group; a condition found in many mammals of the cattle kind, as well as in others. There occur in man also situations hardly found in other animals; as that in which the female has a definite and limited number of husbands, and various combinations or modifications of these two systems. Systems of this sort cannot prevail without excluding many individuals from propagation with the consequent distraction and warfare that this brings. The polygamous system is sometimes defended on the ground that it is the stronger, more warlike males that become the parents of the next generation, the weaker ones being excluded; a measure that is held to be of eugenic value, resulting in continued selection and consequent steady raising (in a certain direction) of the level of the population. But whether this notion is sound or unsound, the tendencies of the human race appear distinctly against this condition and it seems certain to disappear; it yields disturbances, distractions, and other consequences that are felt to be undesirable. The monogamous family appears at present the system of greatest stability in man, though itself with irregularities and unstable points.

Another system proposed for man and to some extent practiced is that of temporary families, such as we find in many birds and other animals. Individuals are to become mates for a longer or shorter period, separating as they please. This system, unless supplemented in some radical way, as by social care of the offspring, ignores the long period of dependence of the children on the parents; the result of which is that the frequent separation or change of mates gives serious wrenches to the framework of society; injures the children, distracts and distresses the parents. This system, therefore, cannot be held to

meet adequately the difficult problems of the relations of parent and offspring; cannot be considered an efficient system for smooth social working, for peace and prosperity. If defended, it must be by the extreme selectionist who holds that severe and unfavorable living conditions, with a high death rate, are in the long run advantageous to the species. If combined with the prevention of the production of offspring, as often proposed, and as seems indispensable if it is not to give rise to immediate distress and dislocation, it must result in the extinction of the species; or else it must prevail in only part of the population, another part living under some system adequate to the care of the offspring. This distinction into two such groups seems likely itself to result in discord.

In some quarters we meet an aspiration for a system showing the essential features of that found in those insects whose social organization has advanced far beyond our own; a system in which from the beginning the social group as a whole shall care for the offspring, thus making the family unnecessary. In this way the individual parents are to be relieved; set free each to pursue his or her life career without interference from offspring or mate. As we find it in popular modern proposals, this aspiration appears largely dominated by the desire to set free and give full satisfaction to the mating impulses; to facilitate change of mates, making it unnecessary for them to remain tied to one another longer than fancy dictates. If we examine this aspect of the matter in the animals that have fully carried out this system of public care for the progeny, we find a surprising result. The system has resulted, not in the freeing of the mating impulses, but in their suppression; their almost complete extinction; in the essential desexualization of society. Only a few isolated

individuals continue to be occupied with mating and propagation; the rank and file are sexless. If man must look to this result, possibly the enthusiasm for this system will abate.

Indeed, it appears that man must meet very great difficulty in inaugurating any thoroughgoing system of social care of the offspring, through the fact that he has already made extensive progress in the opposite direction — in the direction of care of the offspring by the immediate parents; through the fact that he is a mammal instead of an insect. In the insects the mother has never been long and intimately identified with the offspring until it is far developed, as is the case in man. That long and intimate physical union has modified all her characteristics, and through her those of the species as a whole; for inheritance occurs in many respects from one sex to the other. In man separation of parent from offspring is impossible for a long period, and if hurried, even after physical union has ceased, it may turn out that this will lead to a serious injury to parent and offspring. To discover the proper period for separation of the lives of the two is a matter for long and careful study; for observation and experimentation; not for the application of *a-priori* principles.

It may indeed be questioned whether man has not been too late in starting on a radical plan for the supplanting of the family by society as a whole. To make a thorough success of this, he should have begun it æons ago, before he became a mammal. In that case by the present time he might perhaps hope to rival the ants in social organization.

A valiant and venturesome attempt to meet this difficulty lies in the suggestion of J. B. S. Haldane in his book-

let on 'Science and the Future'; and Charlotte Haldane has pictured for us society as it may be after the plan is carried out. The human germ gland is to be artificially and impersonally cultivated in isolation by modern methods of tissue culture. The germ cells are to be likewise developed from the start in incubators; these to be followed by other public institutions for later stages, till development and education are complete. Such a proposal helps to visualize the very great biological difficulty involved in the attempt to change the direction of evolution of man; to reverse the long course he has traveled toward the family system; to transform him from a mammal to something else; to start him on a course leading to replacement of the family and the parent by society as a whole. Evolution is never closed; and what man may become through millions of years of effort in that direction no one can say. But certainly a long and hard road would have to be traveled before that plan could be made a success. The varied difficulties presented by the present nature of man: the fact that he is a mammal; his long and helpless infancy; the high development of his mating and parental impulses; and his diversified and exacting life career appear to be met most adequately (though obviously still imperfectly) by the lifelong monogamous family.

And now a word further in biological characterization of such a family as we find it in man. What are the peculiarities of the family, as a group of individuals?

The family is a small group of individuals that share in a common stock of genes, furnished by the two parents; and that also share a common environment, of which the members of the family are themselves the most potent factors. As compared with a set of individuals taken at

random, their inherited differences are less and their environmental differences are less. But it is a serious error to assume uniformity in the family, in respect of either inheritance or environment. The method of shuffling, distributing, and recombining the genes of the parents insures that no child shall be like either parent in its genetic constitution; nor like any other child (with the probable exception of identical twins, derived from a single fertilized egg). In consequence of these genetic differences, the members of the family differ considerably in the way they develop; in the way they respond to a given environment; in their behavior under given conditions; in what we call temperament, mentality, character. Even if it were possible to make the environment the same for all members of the family, it is by no means to be expected that all should develop the same type of personality; there are deep-lying and far-reaching differences in their original constitutions.

But the effective environment, like the genetic constitution, is never the same for the different members of the family. Owing to the powerful organic relations uniting them — the mating relation, the parental relation — the diverse members act upon each other as the most effective environmental agents that touch them; profoundly affecting their development and behavior. The differences resulting from the multiplicity of life and the change of days insure that no two members shall have the same effective environment. This diversity of environment, like the diversity in genetic constitution, may also induce great differences in what we call temperament, mentality, character. Particularly effective in these respects, we are told by those who have studied the matter, are the things that happen in early life, from birth to say

eighteen months, possibly also those that happen before birth. Even if the genetic constitutions of the members of the family were the same, these causes might be expected to induce differences in the traits of later life; though of the specific effects of particular happenings there is little knowledge, save that it appears that small events may have very great after effects.

And since both genetic constitution and effective environment are diverse for every member of the family, it may be difficult or impossible to know certainly to which set any later peculiarity is due; usually both have been at work. It is a favored occupation of students in one field or the other to argue that all important peculiarities of individuals are due exclusively to that one of these things whose effectiveness they have themselves studied; to heredity alone; or to environment alone. For a long period environment, training, was held responsible for everything. Then for some recent years the all-might of heredity has been the favored dogma. Now there is coming a reaction, doubtless a useful reaction, and, under the leadership of Watson and the Behaviorists, the all-might of the environment is again proclaimed. It seems to be the fate of many doctrines to vibrate between two errors: so difficult is it for man to conceive that things are not due to single causes, but to the interaction of many. Biological science, rightly considered, supports neither of these extreme views. Environment can do much; a given 'normal' individual (significant limitation) has a wide range of possibilities. Doubtless, as Watson sets forth, any such may become 'doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief' (of a kind), depending on the effective environment. But not all have the same possibilities; some, made by the environment into doctors, become the poor

sticks that we all know in that profession; others become Oslers and Welches. Children of different genetic constitution do not react in the same way to the same environment. One becomes Ludwig van Beethoven, 'possessor of brains,' the greatest musician of history; the other Johann van Beethoven, 'possessor of property.' What biological investigation indicates is that we shall find differences, fundamental differences, in members of the same family due to both categories of causes. The family is a small representative sample of society, whose members affect each other profoundly in both genetic constitution and effective environment. To reject either heredity or environment as potent in moulding its members is a most serious error, leading to practices that are disastrous. To attribute all to heredity is doubtless the more harmful; it discourages effort; it promotes a fatalistic viewpoint. But to attribute all to environment is to encourage teacher and parent in the unfortunate belief that they can fashion all their unhappy subjects on a uniform plan; is to promote that disastrous neglect of individuality which has in the past been the bane of home and school and society.

This aspect of the matter time does not permit following further. In brief summary, when we look at the world of organisms, all under the necessity of finding some reconciliation or compromise between the individual life career and the functions of reproduction, we discover a varied and graded set of systems, tending to fork into two series, with diverse culminations. One series culminates in the lifelong monogamous family, finding exemplars in birds and mammals, with its highest development in man. The other series leads to thoroughgoing social control, with the family in the narrower sense non-existent; of

this series the social insects form the culmination. The present needs of man are what have led to the establishment of the monogamous family, and it appears to meet these needs more fully than any other system yet devised.

II

SOCIAL HERITAGE AND THE FAMILY

W. F. Ogburn

Only within the past decade have we come to recognize the importance of our social heritage, in comparison with our biological inheritance. Formerly, when one spoke of heredity and environment, the term environment usually meant nature only. The great significance of the environment that we now call the social heritage was forgotten, or else more probably thought of as the direct product of man's inherited nature.

The social heritage is a great concept and it will take the social sciences a long time to work out its full meaning. But something of its significance can be seen from its definition. It is that which surrounds us other than the natural environment of soil, climate, fauna, and flora. It consists not only of buildings, machines, and fabricated material objects, but of ways of acting and thinking that find expression in religion, philosophy, art, science, ethical codes, and social institutions, and in this it is synonymous with culture. This is the environment that makes personality, that brings freedom or tyranny, that determines beliefs and gives us knowledge. In the present era it is a great complex, called civilization, that is undergoing rapid change, which has brought many maladjustments and social problems, but which we hope to improve. This is the world which we hope to construct into a 'Kingdom of God on earth' rather than into a 'Garden of Eden.'

As the family is the almost universal institution through

which the biological inheritance is passed on from one generation to another, so also the family is universally important as an agency for passing on the social heritage, though not the exclusive agency, for there are, of course, other patterns almost as universal as the family in continuing the social heritage, as for instance, the community, industry, and religious organizations.

Cultural heritage through the family is twofold, though the dividing line between these two aspects is not altogether sharp. First, the family is an instrument for shaping personality in the children, for determining, for instance, whether the child is to be timid, honest, conservative, or otherwise. Second, it is also a means for passing on the content of the social heritage, for transmitting the knowledge of the ways of doing things, that does not enter so intimately into the character, such for instance as the transmission of the knowledge of language or of how to work.

That our social heritage is a very powerful influence in building personality is being increasingly appreciated, as the specific rôle of instinct is being shown to be less and less and as habit is known to be of greater significance. Behavior among human beings is not as rigidly determined by biological inheritance as it is among the lower animals. The extent to which any human being will be fearful or courageous, daring or indifferent and the sorts of situations that will call forth these reactions are determined largely by his experience. Thus the Crow Indians, living in the *milieu* of warring nations, inculcate personal bravery in their youths to a higher degree than people living in a less warlike setting, by the elaborate system which they have developed for training and encouraging bravery.

Another discovery of modern psychology emphasizes still more how much personality is the product of habit. This discovery is that of the conditioned reflex, a special form of habit. For instance, the pupil of the eye, by inherited nature contracting and expanding to variations of light, can be trained to contract at the ringing of a bell. Much of our behavior that was thus once thought of as instinctive has now been found to be the habit of conditioned reflexes. So it would seem that poets are largely made poets, not born poets, that certainly much of what we call feminine and masculine traits are the product of our culture, that so-called genius can never be wholly a matter of inheritance, and so on. As research shows the specific rôle of instinct to be growing less than was formerly held, just to that extent is our social heritage found to be more important in forming personality.

The family takes rank unquestionably as the social institution of greatest influence, through which our social heritage forms personality. The family environment exercises the earliest influence that the newborn child knows. As the twig is bent, so grows the tree. The earlier the influence the more important it is. It was formerly thought that the personality was completed only when one became an adult. Then the limit was shortened to the age of adolescence. Later it was said that the personality was virtually set by five years of age, and now one hears that the most important influences have got in their work by two years of age.

The family is significant also because of its repetition of stimuli. A limited number of stimuli from mother, nurse, father, brothers, sisters are repeated many times a day. The power of this repetition at an early age is very great. Little drops of water often enough will wear away a large

stone. In biological inheritance the contributions of mother and father are equal by chance, but in forming personality in early life, the contribution of the mother would seem to be greater, custom being as it is. Furthermore, the rôle of the affections, so important for personality, is nurtured in the home, and is associated with the members of the family.

Perhaps it may seem unwise to try to choose for first ranking in importance in determining personality from the three groups of tendencies, the self-preservative, the affectional, or the gregarious. But the studies of disorders of personality, as they appear in neuroses and psychoses, rank the affectional elements as most significant, perhaps because of their possibly greater variability and the readiness with which conditioning occurs in connection with love. The most fertile theory of the functional origin of mental disorders is that the causes are the emotional habits arising out of the early family situation. This hypothesis is maintained even when the precipitating causes of the disaster occur in later life, for, it is argued, these precipitating causes are effective only when the foundation has been laid in the emotional patterns of early childhood.

In accordance with this modern theory of the powerful influence of culture on the personality, researches have been showing that much of what was once thought to have been heredity is in reality the family influence, particularly of the early years of life. Biometricians, for example, show a high correlation of the occupations of fathers and sons, just as they have shown a high correlation between the stature of fathers and sons; and this correlation between the occupations of fathers and sons has been interpreted, like the similarities of stature, as due to

biological inheritance. But when father and son are both lawyers, one should hesitate to assert that the coincidence is due to biological inheritance. The social reasons why the son follows the vocation of the father are not far to seek. By the same reasoning it might be argued that because son, father, grandfather and other ancestors were fishermen, this fact was determined by inherited natural tendencies. Resemblances between parent and child are not to be attributed wholly to heredity; many are due to the strong influences of parents on their young.

That these cultural influences of family life are important is seen from the fact that there are differences in personality according to order of birth. Thus the oldest child tends to be different from the middle children, and the middle children different from the youngest, and the only child tends to have distinguishing characteristics. Biologists say that these differences in personality could hardly be due to differences in the germ plasms. Heredity doesn't explain why the oldest child should be different from the only child.

Since so many environmental influences in the home are the same for all the children, it is evident from these differences in children according to their order of birth, that a comparatively slight variation may be far-reaching and subtle. A. A. Brill has shown ('Introduction to Psychoanalysis') that the only child is found among neurotics in unusually large numbers, and that he is less fitted for the struggle for existence than other children. Yet the only child is also exceptional in achievement. From my own unpublished researches it seems clear that he appears in 'Who's Who' more frequently than in the general population. So, also, only children marry later in life and smaller percentages of only children are married than of

other children. The names of oldest children also appear in 'Who's Who' more frequently in proportion to their total number than do the names of middle children, while the youngest children appear more frequently than middle children but less frequently than the oldest children. There are also differences between children and order of birth in regard to radicalism; and it seems probable that the incidence of insanity is slightly unequal according to the order of birth.

The family is becoming much smaller; there are many families with only one child and not many with three children. This change in the size of the family will have an effect on the personality of the children. Perhaps it may increase the percentage of exceptionally capable children mentally, but it may also result in an increase of nervousness and mental disorders. The obvious types of family influence are quite well known, but for that reason are frequently taken for granted. The newer evidence of the family influence on personality comes from the studies of nervous disorders and the phenomena of the conditioned reflex. Thus it appears, for instance, that the rôle of a dominant, unaffectionate, disciplinary type of father is a tremendous influence in forming the personality of the child. The child may develop a reaction of rebellion against his father and acquire a pattern of reaction that may be set in motion later in life by many other stimuli than the original one of the father. Thus the institution of the police, of the courts, of an authoritarian government may arouse hostility, and indeed the individual with such childhood experiences may develop from this action pattern a whole social philosophy of, say, *laissez-faire* liberalism.

So also it seems true that the sort of stimuli that are

most effective in arousing feelings of affection and hate are like the stimuli of members of the family operating in early childhood. Emotional patterns are set up in early childhood that often are so particularized that they can be aroused in later life only by individuals who resemble these members of the family around whom the patterns were first built. Thus one may be able to have as close friends, lovers, husbands, or wives, only those who resemble strongly a parent, brother, sister, or playmate.

It is true, of course, that not all of these early cultural influences on personality operate through the medium of the family alone. Play groups outside the family and the schools for very young children are the next most important groups. Possibly the changing family may lose to such groups as these some of its functions in forming the personality of its very young members, as it appears to be losing other functions. But in so far as the personality factors exercise their functions at very early ages, the family is likely to continue as the main influence in forming the personality of the children.

The function of passing on the content of the social heritage, such as language, for example, the family shares with other social institutions. Thus the churches carry on the religious tradition. The various economic organizations for manufacture and commerce carry on the stream of the social heritage for their particular province, quite generally without the services of the family, as also, in their respective fields, the schools, libraries and other societies and groups.

It is possible that during the past two or three thousand years in Europe the family has as a functioning social institution reached the highest point which it has ever attained within the one hundred thousand years more or

less that there has been human society. But within the past century there has been a precipitous fall from this pinnacle. The functions of the family have been declining very rapidly since the invention of the factory run by steam, aided by innumerable numbers of mechanical inventions. In the agricultural era which preceded this industrial age, the functions performed largely by the family were six — affectional, economic, recreational, protective, religious, and educational. Spinning, weaving, sewing, the production of food, the preparation of food, laundering, the production of soap, and many other economically productive functions have all left the ægis of the family in whole or in part, changing the nature of the employment of men and women, and particularly taking away from women their ancient employment. The loss of economic functions is most noticeable in the large modern city among apartment-house dwellers, less developed among families in the smaller towns and in the country.

Other functions of the family have similarly declined. Recreation is found outside the home. In earlier times education, very broadly conceived, was in large part a function of the family, including physical education, manual training, domestic science, and vocational education. To-day very few of these forms of education remain in the home. In feudal times the protection of the home, the women, children, the aged and dependent kin, was in part a function of the father and male relative. The loss of these functions has been due in large part to the mechanical inventions resulting in the growth of cities and factories. Perhaps the loss of the religious functions, which even determined that only persons of certain religious affiliations could intermarry and found a family,

seems due to changes in the nature of religious beliefs rather than to economic and mechanical changes.

These losses of functions may mean that the spindle and the loom have now completely disappeared as symbols of home life, and the laundry tub, the sewing machine, family games and the prayer book are following them. Indeed the cooking stove, the broom and even the cradle seem to be taking flight also! The invention and diffusion of methods of birth control must take rank with steam and the multi-family dwelling as significant inventions affecting the family. It has been particularly the means of a great reduction in the number of children, which has cut down the activities of the family in a purely quantitative way so that they are comprised in a very short period.

Some of these functions which are an integral part of social life have not disappeared but have simply shifted from the family to other social agencies, especially to the industries, with their welfare work, and to the state, that is, all the organs of city, county, state, provincial and national governments. The decline of the *laissez-faire* theory of government is due in large part to the decline of the family, a cause not usually recognized, especially by conservatives. The great extension of government by commissions and boards to so many different fields has as a cause the changes in the modern family. The juvenile court and the school take the place of the parent for the time and in regard to certain matters. We even say that modern government is 'paternalistic,' fatherly. The decline of the family is thus a cause of the great wave of government control that is spreading over all modern governments, and is in part also a cause of the drift in the direction of socialism. Also in many communities, par-

ticularly the industrially owned towns, industries with their elaborate welfare plans have developed functions which were formerly performed by the family but which cannot well be performed by them under the new conditions.

Moreover, the trend in the loss of functions shows little slackening and no tendency to turn and move in the opposite direction. Manufacturing is growing much faster than agriculture. Women are entering industry at a greater rate than the growth of population. The schools are taking the children at earlier ages. Protective legislation and paternalistic government activities are increasing. Recreation is becoming more commercialized and finds expression outside the family. These trends are effective for rural homes and in the towns as well as among city dwellers.

It is very difficult to predict the future, particularly in the social sciences. Furthermore, prediction is accurate usually in inverse ratio to the length of time it covers. So, for the immediate future one may simply observe that the trends seem to be moving as they have in the past. One may further speculate that as many of these changes in the family have been due to mechanical inventions which produced factories and cities, so new mechanical inventions may in the future, again quite change the course of the family. But what the new inventions will be cannot be told. The radio, for instance, may be an invention that will help to return certain activities to the home. The cheaper and wider distribution of electricity, if accompanied by certain mechanical inventions, might tend to restore industries to the home. New inventions again may revolutionize the family in opposite directions.

This brief analysis has been a record of facts or of prob-

able facts. There has been no attempt to say whether they are good or bad. Yet perhaps we may venture to speculate a little regarding their value.

That the family environment is so important for personality is a fact of prime significance. It puts a great deal of responsibility on parents; and this new knowledge raises the family to new and greater importance. But one must not assume that the family influence on personality is wholly good, even from religious households. What has been shown is that the family influence is powerful. It may be powerful for good or powerful for evil. The many different family situations that cause neurosis show that the family influence may be quite bad, even when following accepted conventional channels of goodness. Mother love is usually extolled to the skies; it is supposed that one can never get too much of it; yet it may very truly be a damaging force to personality if bestowed unwisely and too frequently. Family influences may produce the shut-in type of personality, develop timidity and sensitiveness, and cause neurosis. So also the child who feels himself not loved may develop feelings of inferiority and other abnormalities.

Granted that the power of the family may be exercised harmfully as well as beneficially, the future course of the family is not likely to see this force diminished appreciably. But with the small-family system of one or two children, the nature of the family environment is changed appreciably and it is very probable that with the small-family system the chances of producing extraordinarily bright children or extremely nervous children is considerably increased. There is a serious possibility that this situation may be laying the foundation for mental disorders. For it is probable that the strains of

modern city life precipitate upon feeble foundations neuroses that would never develop in the simpler rural environment. Mental disorders are astoundingly frequent to-day. The chances of an adult in New York State being placed in an insane asylum is about one in twenty-five.

But just as inventions have precipitated wholesale changes in the family, so also discoveries in psychology and sociology may enable us to avoid the production of disordered personalities and rather to produce more exceptionally able children. It may be, therefore, that the small-family system will be made to produce more children with high intelligence quotients and less neurotic, but this desideratum will only be brought about by the thoroughgoing application of intelligence and knowledge not yet definitely proved.

So also the tremendous loss of functions by the family is an established fact that may promise some good or some bad outcome, depending on the adjustments that are made. If the schools can be made to educate children better than the family can, then this shift of functions is a net gain. So also if other social agencies, such as the State and industry, can carry on their activities better than the family once did, the loss to the family is a gain to society.

But when these many activities are shifted from the family to other social groups, what will happen to the family? I believe that it is quite possible, even probable, that the family will emerge a more harmonious institution, though such an end is hardly conceivable to those whose eyes are turned backward. The family is a little group of persons who stay together because of certain attractions or bonds or ties; otherwise they would move and

live apart. These bonds are — or have been — the economic bond, the protective, the educational, the religious, the recreational and one other very important one, the affectional. All these common activities helped to keep the family intact as a group, though they have not been strong enough, however, always to hold family groups wholly together, for aside from death, some families everywhere have been disrupted by separation or divorce. As all these bonds, except the tie of affection, have been materially weakened during the past century, it is natural that the family would fall apart more frequently. The loss of these functions means then that the family largely must look to one bond alone to hold it intact, namely, the bond of affection.

Surely this is not so dismal a prospect as some of our calamity howlers think — a prospect of families based on affection. When the family was a business partnership affection may never have existed, or it may have been turned into hate or irritation or suffering between husband and wife, and indeed the affectional relation between child and parent may have been overlaid by cruelty and authority, by restricted personality, by a domination that left no freedom. Yet with affection gone, a family group had to continue because of external ties.

With the changed conditions, the family must rely much more on affection. With birth control, with women working outside the home, with fewer children, and with more frequent divorce, it seems very probable that much more attention will be given to the affectional element. And while separation and divorce may be more frequent, it is quite probable that the average quantity of affection (to use a statistical concept) per family unit remaining intact or founded anew after divorce will be much higher

than was the case when the family was held together by many other bonds. This may not be the case, however, for there are many forces in modern life that produce nervousness, and nervous men and women find it more difficult than others to find suitable mates. The conditions of modern life also present certain strains on affection.

There are some who think that affection is not a solid enough foundation on which to build the family structure, but these I think are also people whose eyes are turned backward. Yet in taking opposition to their views, we must not be dogmatic or let our wishful thinking dictate our conclusions. In truth, science has as yet very little to tell us of the causes and habits which build affection. The topic has been taboo. Yet it seems very probable that science and the subsequent diffusion of what it will discover about affection and the learning process will do much to make affection between all the members a more frequent affair in the family. Those who would solve family problems and try to direct the course of evolution of the family toward better channels must work to discover as much as possible about the science and art of affection for parents and children as well as husbands and wives and to disseminate these fundamentally important discoveries as widely as possible.

In the main, the most rapid changes have been taking place in the mechanical and economic parts of our social heritage, with which the social organization is in close association and adjustment, while the family organization has been a little slow in changing to keep up with the changes in those other parts of culture, a conclusion quite contrary to the opinion of many who think that the family has been changing too fast. There has been a true

'cultural lag.' Woman's place is still considered to be in the home, even when her occupations have been taken away in large part for the greater period of her married life. There are perhaps fewer persons married, although within the past thirty years the percentage of the population married has increased. The age of marriage has probably been postponed since the agricultural period. The relation of child to parent has become more complicated and resulted in more maladjusted children, due in large part to the economic changes to which the family has not yet become adjusted. Divorce and separation have increased enormously. There are these many evidences of maladjustments of the family to the changed social conditions. These maladjustments are the result of the hangover of theories, policies, ethics that were quite appropriate for the family under the simpler agricultural conditions, but which are not now suited to the changed conditions; they are due to a failure of the family to meet the new conditions.

How shall these new and better adjustments be made? Not by clinging to the old beliefs and customs, for the old conditions of agriculture and home industry cannot be brought back with culture as it is, nor the mores that grew up with them. The family will have to work out new adjustments to the small family, to a family with reduced production in the home for women, to a family which is not to be held together so much by economic and social bonds, but which is to be based on affection. To make these adjustments the family will have to make new inventions and utilize new researches in the psychology of personality, utilize new knowledge regarding the habits and practices of affection, and the new discoveries regarding the training of children. It does not seem probable

that the family will recover the functions it has lost. But even if the family doesn't produce thread and cloth and soap and medicine and food, it can still produce happiness, which does not seem such a very bad thing to do, after all.

PART II

THE FOUNDING OF NEW FAMILIES

III

A CHALLENGE

DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER

WHEN doctors are talking of the medical information to cope with the new modern complexities of marriage and parenthood, and psychiatrists of mental analyses, social workers of economic difficulties, alienists of the dark problems of unbalance, what can a mere wife and mother and housekeeper have to add? Certainly nothing definite and concrete in detail . . . if for no other reason than that life has taught her a distrust of too-carefully laid-out programmes of any sort when human beings are concerned.

And yet there is something I feel like calling out, in my unprofessional way, with my heart in my voice. *Nothing is more needed as a foundation for these personal relationships than a state of mind, a song to march to, some stirring fanfare, the sort of bright brazen challenge which from the beginning of time has stirred human blood to action.* 'The song of the Lord began with trumpets,' says the Bible somewhere. In the scientific thinking which is an absolute prerequisite of accurate advance, we cannot forget the whole-hearted joy in the possibilities of success which is the only thing that makes possible any advance at all, accurate or fumbling.

As I look around me, in these years, upon the anxious thoughtful faces of people who are thinking about modern marriage and parenthood, and read the apprehensive

screeds of many of those who write about the changes in those institutions, I am dismayed by the absence of what I had thought one virtue always to be counted on in our pioneer America — the virtue of courage and cheer and hopefulness in turning the face toward the future and away from the past. I am astonished by the careworn taking thought as to the dangers and difficulties, and the absence of hurrahs over the prize to be won. We are all brought up on the story of the Pilgrims and of the stout-heartedness of those ancestors of ours who did not, one of them, turn back toward the established past and, frightened by the unknown, return to England when the Mayflower returned. What has become of that pioneering spirit, and that other one which sent strong men and women adventurously out to conquer the new continent?

In all the talk about the unknown future of marriage and parenthood I hear no echo of the instinctive rush of high spirits over obstacles to conquer, none of our old traditional delight in exploring and taming the unknown. We seem to be heavyheartedly stooping over the broken pieces of the past, rather than plunging our hands eagerly into the plastic clay of the future.

Is it possible that we don't recognize the situation as the moral equivalent of the material one faced by our forefathers, out of which they created our present world, materially so marvelous, wherein materially we are so astonishingly at our ease? Here we stand, facing a new world of human relationship, as new as America was to those English people three centuries ago. There it lies, waiting for us to shape it into the background of strong and healthy and happy lives for our descendants. Even if we would we cannot retreat into the old world of the

past. There is no moral Mayflower that could possibly carry us back to bring up our families along the lines fixed by the old traditions. We must move forward, pushed by the irresistible momentum of change; we might at least, even the most timid or thought-taking among us, make a virtue of necessity, and step off boldly into the unknown world, with that alert self-possessed eye which alone can discern and shape the new possibilities in a new region.

There is no denying that we are leaving behind us some sweet and pleasant aspects of life which will never be seen again. So did the Pilgrims. Never were they or their descendants to know again the pleasant comfortable leisure of well-to-do people attended and served by a class who were resigned to being considered only half human. The pleasant repose of the older home, when the women and the younger generation had no thought of being allowed wholly human dignity or freedom of action, is gone forever. There is no denying that the rule of autocracy is simpler and often quieter than any other form of organization. But we cannot return to it even if we would and in our hearts we know that we would now find something so ignoble and base as the foundations of such peace and quietness that we could not endure it, either as autocrat or as serf.

No, we cannot live ourselves back to the old quietly ordered world with its unquestioned traditions and standards. But why this uneasiness about what is before us? Why this absence of stout-hearted self-confidence that we can find our way about in it without losing our way? What *is* before us? I'll tell you. As wonderful an opportunity as the human race has ever seen for the exercise of the most deeply satisfying of all our instincts,

the instinct to create. It is a truism that only those human beings are healthy and happy who are creating something. Human beings starve and die morally if they are denied creative occupation. The happiness of a poverty-stricken unknown artist compared to the stuffy, idle rich man is proverbial, a platitude worn threadbare because of its very truth.

Now, before every one of us, since every one has personal relations, lies a whole new world to be shaped by creative instinct. There lie the raw materials of glory — the same old primitively necessary human ties without which the race has never been able to exist a moment . . . mating, parenthood, responsibility of one for another. Broken and gone are many of the ugly old fetters which hampered the movements of all, and rubbed raw sores on the limbs of many. Some order and discipline there must be — such is the essence of creative art which by order and discipline and intelligence and inspiration creates something finished and beautiful out of raw material. Out of the capacity to scream aloud, the creative impulse has made Wagnerian operas. Out of the hardness and heaviness of stone, it has built up cathedrals to the glory of God. There lies our raw material — the relationship between men and women, between parents and their children.

We know from the core of our beings that beautiful things can be made of such relationships, and the glowing certainty of this seems to me to be the first element in any training to cope with them.

The moral Mayflower has landed us on a stern and rock-bound coast with a whole new world before us, rich with dangers, rich beyond imaginings with lovely possibilities. Careful thought and training, as to diet, psychology,

household budgets, physical sex relations are necessary for the new task. Yes, of course, but they will achieve nothing but weariness of spirit if they are not warmed and vitalized by a glowing sense of the new possibilities for happiness and growth and honesty and strength in the new family.

We are Americans all. Every one of us is on this continent only because we or our fathers preferred to shape new material into new life, rather than live on in the old forms. We are every one of us of the race of pioneers. Here is a new frontier to be conquered, a new spiritual region to be subdued. Now is the time for the old half-humorous, wholly dauntless pioneer spirit to burn up bravely and boldly. On the covered wagons crawling over the illimitable plains at a snail's pace, they blazoned out 'Pike's Peak or bust' . . . and built one of the finest cities in the world at the foot of Pike's Peak.

Let us hang out a banner bearing some such device as 'Free and happy homes or bust,' and see before us not the difficulties and complexities of the road, not even the shadowy wayside cemeteries for the fallen, but the bright beauty of the goal.

No human beings ever had a brighter goal before them. To learn how to live nobly and wisely with a true mate, to learn how to help the younger generation with one's experience and not to hamper it, to learn how to help less favored human beings on toward this goal . . . never did any generation have a richer or more rewarding frontier to conquer.

It is all very well to observe that the bridges are not yet built, nor the roads made that lead into it. But not too much wrinkling of the brows over these, if you please, not too much heaviness of heart over occasional dangerous

fords to cross, not too much appearance of anxiety on the part of the leaders — lest the rank and file lose heart, forget the glory of the struggle and the golden rewards for those who succeed.

IV

EDUCATION FOR FAMILY LIFE

ERNEST R. GROVES

WHY does it now seem necessary to provide education for marriage and parenthood, since in the past families seem to have gone on efficiently without it? The answer lies in the changed conditions of life and a clearer understanding of the value of specific training for social situations. The extension of science into the field of personality has caused a rapid breaking down of traditions regarding family life, and this brings the realization that in our time every human value must be protected by special educational effort. We have traveled a long way from the biological family; like other institutions, the family has become artificial, complicated, and now rests upon a cultural basis rather than upon original instincts or social necessities. It is unreasonable to suppose that in all departments of life except that of the family we could enjoy the advantages of a many-faceted civilization which has been carried far beyond the elementary needs of man through the enrichment of culture, and still have the home continue on a spontaneous and impulsive basis.

Out of the multiplicity of our interests with the resulting specialization, there has come a separation in the cultural stream so that society no longer transmits as one consistent whole the values it has perpetuated. The family is no longer automatically protected by our social habits, but must depend for its vitality and achievement upon organization in the way that all the major interests of life get their security. The fact that it is the last to re-

ceive its share of attention only makes its predicament the more apparent, while at the same time it discloses the reluctance of human nature to realize that the family is not a self-perpetuating institution.

Both marriage and parenthood are affected, and the hazard of each is heightened. In the case of marriage, the motives and attitudes that modify the developing individual lead away from the home as well as toward it. Concretely this is often illustrated by those people who for political, social or commercial success sacrifice the desires that support the family, until their interests in marriage and children are smothered, thus producing a home experience that is both meager and unsatisfying. There seems at present to be no way by which the competition the family receives from the outside can be decreased. The only way in which the family can receive its fair proportion of human interest is to provide it with a special organization that will keep its interests prominent in cultural routine.

The situation of the family is not primarily due to an attack by opposing forces, but rather to the neglect that necessarily follows in our time when any interest in life does not have the advantage of special organization. In a culture as divergent as ours, with the separated forms of appeal that are made upon human nature for its time and interest, the family would be left defenseless and its function reduced to the lowest possible terms, if nothing were done by those who undertake to influence the flow of human culture, in an effort to give the family its just importance. In other words, the family is being crowded out by the richness of modern culture and by an inadequate effort to use our educational resources to conserve its interests.

The challenge that comes to marriage travels on the level of pleasure and demands the giving of happiness. Marriage must accept the testing of modern youth who turn toward it as a means of gratifying individual desires. Religious obligation and social duty pass into the background, for it has become characteristic of our time not only to enter marriage under the spell of pleasure motives, but also to retreat from it just as soon as it ceases to advance happiness. The same situation is developing with reference to parenthood, and a large portion of our population decides whether to have children at all, or how many to have, by arguments that issue from a philosophy of pleasure-seeking. How could we expect either marriage or parenthood to keep apart from the prevailing atmosphere and win their place in the general scheme of things by a different sort of appeal than that which belongs to other interests of life?

Of course it is unfortunate that at a time when the personal responsibilities of family obligations are so easily shed and such large demands are made by husbands, wives and parents for pleasurable experiences, the hazards of marriage and parenthood should be so great. This could not be otherwise, for the urge that turns one toward pleasure leads to impatience, restlessness and a narrow grasp in the appraisal of family values. Whoever becomes interested in conserving the family must recognize in the beginning that human nature is asking more of marriage and the home than ever before and at the same time making it difficult for the family to function sufficiently to yield the satisfactions desired. Some wish to help the family by lessening the demands made upon it by those who seek pleasurable satisfactions, but there is no hope of changing the present attitude unless our entire

cultural habits are reorganized on a different basis. Legislation which attempts to force the carrying on of family relationships that individuals desire to repudiate gives no promise, at least for some time to come, of being successful. Hope lies in another quarter. Society must protect the family by using its educational resources. Instruction provides the best way of bringing about a discrimination of values in living and establishing the basis of a satisfying career in marriage and as a parent.

It is hopeless, in our desire to accomplish results, to run ahead of the facts which are available at present. The training that is useful in conserving the family must come out of experience, and at present we must recognize frankly that we do not have the factual knowledge we desire. Especially do we need more information regarding successful marriages, how they became satisfying and what difficulties were met by the persons concerned, and how surmounted. We can get the benefit of the study of marriage failures; of such material there is a sufficiency. What we need now is to enlist the interest of those who find their married life delightful and are willing to take us into their confidence to reveal as far as possible the methods by which they have won their successes.

The same situation is true with reference to children; we need now to emphasize the normal child, or at least the child that has no great difficulties of adjustment or peculiar handicaps. Child-training is not a special sort of surgery nor the treatment of a universal form of disease through which human nature has to pass in its effort to get to maturity. The danger of over-stressing causal knowledge with reference to the effect of childhood experiences of an unsatisfactory character upon later development is apparent. We have little evidence of the

absolute determination of the happenings of childhood upon the final personality growth which so many seem to be taking for granted. There is, however, abundant material which demonstrates that in childhood we do most to help or hinder the development of wholesome character and outlook upon life. Only as we can gather and popularize this material regarding marriage and the parenthood relationship, as a basis for instruction, can much be done toward education for either parenthood or marriage.

Meanwhile it is well to recognize how attractive is the opportunity of giving this new instruction to those who are seeking a virgin field for exploitation. There are enough troubled and baffled parents and perplexed husbands and wives and skeptical lovers to invite the self-seeker to the undertaking of the new type of education. This risk is not entirely future; it is already with us. Those who love to instruct and have the parrot facility of repetition are already casting their eyes upon this opportunity. Then also those who cover up an itch for interference by rationalizing their habits of meddling as efforts of service have caught sight of another chance to exercise their power. The greatest need of all in the movement of educating for marriage and parenthood is to keep it from becoming either a fad or a species of social exploitation. The more the new type of instruction is linked up with existing educational institutions, the greater will be its sanity; at best any programme for the conservation of family life will carry risk. As the mere phrase-maker and the pseudo-scientist rush into the enterprise, much mischief will result and the growing confidence of the public will be quickly lost.

Education for marriage and parenthood is the reason-

able next step. Hopeful as it is likely to be, it has no power to perform miracles. No one acquainted with the history of social experience would expect quickly to change the balance of harmful and useful influences that operate upon human character. Progress comes slowly, but education has a large part in bringing it about. Family life is influenced by too many things and is too much a reflection of the current manner of living for any type of instruction completely to dominate home activities so as to make all marriages happy and all parents wise. As the situation is, the family is certain to fall further behind and marriage to show an increasing percentage of failure if no effort be made to contribute to the welfare of the home by special instruction.

The situation in which the family finds itself looks to the higher institutions of learning for leadership in education for marriage and parenthood. It is easier to carry on the necessary experiments in family instruction at the higher levels of education; indeed one wonders how it has come about that institutions whose primary purpose is to advance human culture have been so hesitant in training for the most important of all human relationships. Of course education for marriage and parenthood is something quite different from sex training, although the latter has to be included.

There is special need of giving pre-family education in normal schools, schools of law and theological seminaries. From the normal schools come teachers who easily, through ignorance, hamper family life. Law, through legislation, influences the family constantly, and it is most important that those trained in legal matters should have a grasp of the science of family relationships. From the ministers we expect assistance in furthering every sort

of wholesome social enterprise, and if their idealism is actually to function in service for the family they need to be better grounded in the application of science to family problems; this is particularly true of the Protestant clergy who at present do not develop from experience the concrete understanding of family difficulties that the priests through confession more frequently attain.

Training for marriage and parenthood will prove of little value if taught as a system of recipes; what is needed is not a set of rules, which most certainly would lead those who followed their precepts into mishaps, but a basis for insight. This fact reveals the place where the new instruction encounters limitation. Already even thoughtful parents are dissatisfied by instruction that does not lead to rules which they can easily follow. However one might like it, the fact remains that information that can really function in the family cannot be mechanical in nature. It is adaptability to meet rapidly changing conditions that both husbands and wives and parents require to pass successfully the tests of everyday experience. Yet there are many who seek a rule of thumb method and who adopt a system that they will attempt to carry out with little sense of the need of adaptation. This explains why an element of disappointment is bound to follow even the most serious effort to provide training for family life.

Were it not for the information that recently has been gathered by psychology, psychiatry and sociology, particularly the first two, there would be little hope of giving substance to pre-marriage and parenthood training. The better knowledge that we have recently gained in the understanding of personality provides the source from

which much wisdom has to be gathered for the establishment of profitable courses for those interested in marriage and parenthood. In spite of the prevailing confusion, due to differences of opinion among the scientists that attempt to interpret human behavior, enough has been accomplished to provide the means for instruction that will conserve the family.

Very recently sociology also has become more conscious of the necessity of adding its part to the general fund of information that helps in the understanding of human relationships and is making a more serious effort to analyze the family, not as an institution but as a relationship in which the personality receives its expression. The family is being studied with a different attitude, and the change in viewpoint is the largest contribution the science of sociology has yet made to family welfare. Although pathological family life has occupied the center of attention, there is a growing feeling among students that sociology must somehow find a means of getting more accurate information concerning successful family life. Science still relatively neglects the significant place that parenthood holds in the social machinery which perpetuates culture. There is, however, especially among the younger sociologists, a marked trend away from this former indifference to the social experiences of children as an influence upon the growth of culture.

When we ask where and how, and by whom the new instruction should be given, we come squarely face to face with the need of more experiment before any programme is finally determined. Surely part of this necessary education must appear somehow in our schools, even if it be only in elementary form and as a means of building up the idea that there is material which can be had by those

interested, which helps to meet the problems of marriage and parenthood. The churches also have an obligation to serve the family by delivering helpful information. It would appear that this must be done mostly by bringing to the churches either specialists or a popular interpretation of their findings, and although no one would ask the minister to take over, in ordinary cases, the task of instruction, he can by a changed attitude in looking at the family on its social side advance the notion that science can help marriage and the parent just as it now serves the child's physical needs. Special organizations like the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. have a clear duty and one that they are beginning to recognize; the experiments they have already made are most important, for an effective programme can only be worked out on the basis of experience, which carefully collects, analyzes and tests the facts already at our command.

The largest service that could be rendered the family in providing instruction is in the hands of the community itself. It would be disastrous to attempt to work out a community programme prematurely, for it is likely to be the last step. If a beginning could be made by private organizations that serve the entire community, as the family welfare societies serve part of it, we might begin to see more clearly the necessity of attempting to prevent rather than to patch up the domestic difficulties that are so often the root of family tragedy. There is real need of some sort of matrimonial clinic to which seekers for help can come to get unbiased assistance grounded on practical experience and a basic understanding of behavior problems, and perhaps no contribution at present will prove of greater benefit to national need than experimentation along this line by the more progressive family welfare societies.

V

THE CONCERN OF THE COMMUNITY WITH MARRIAGE

MARY E. RICHMOND

MARRIAGE seems to have been sharing the fate of many good melodies. Once afloat in the world, they are taken up, as a wise observer noted long ago, 'by all sorts of instruments, some of them woefully coarse, feeble, or out of tune,' until people are in danger of crying out that the themes and the melodies are themselves detestable. Human beings tend to oversimplify in this way. It saves trouble to ignore the nature of the instrument; it saves thought to pronounce this great social institution of marriage altogether good or altogether bad. And in these days of so many specialties, when life is becoming thoroughly compartmented, we are in graver danger than ever before of condemning both marriages and melodies from a too narrow, too specialized point of view.

Social reformers are apt to say, 'Why doesn't the State attend to such glaring evils as these that we see all about us — the divorces, the unhappiness? What we need is a new State law.' Or, as they have been taught to exclaim more recently, 'What we need is an amendment to the Federal Constitution.' Certain of the specialists, on the other hand, are equally prompt to decide that marriage is not the State's or the Nation's business at all; they are convinced that, especially where no children are involved, marital and sex relations are nobody's business but the business of the two persons concerned. The group that

champions this latter conclusion has the formidable backing of Havelock Ellis, Bertrand Russell, and H. G. Wells. But Havelock Ellis is a physiological psychologist; Russell was first a mathematician, though in these later days he has devoted himself to philosophy; while Wells — I don't know what Wells is, save that he is *not* an historian. All of them seem to forget that man is a social animal and that this one fact colors and to a large degree controls every one of his relationships.

When a specialist in any science comes forward to settle finally and on the basis of his own specialty a matter like this of marriage, which whatever else it may happen to be is also social, I am reminded of the comments of a columnist about a chemical convention held recently. One of the chemists at this meeting had predicted that chemistry would soon discover an antidote for fatigue poisons which would do away with sleep. The columnist, after wondering what would become of the psychoanalysts, continued: 'Fifty-one weeks in the year there is no more plodding, patient, humble, and incidentally underpaid member of society than the scientist in his laboratory. He measures with relentless caution. He probes with almost suicidal skepticism. . . . But when the scientist has put away his tubes, washed his hands, packed his dinner jacket, and joined his fellow scientists in annual session, he lets himself go. He will glance at nothing less than a human race and concern himself with nothing less than a cosmos.'

These cosmic forecasts of the biologist, the physiologist, the psychologist, the eugenicist, sometimes touch in their prophetic sweep the subject of marriage. At such times it is well to remind ourselves of the lavish gifts that science has already been able to bestow

upon our modern world by its *united* approach to such a subject of outstanding importance as health, for example. When the physicians and laboratory men of a generation ago looked over the top of their professional and watertight compartments at the world outside, they discovered an intimate relation between their study and treatment of disease and the health of the nation. Thanks to their willingness to take a new point of view and to unite their efforts with those of mere laymen, things that then were the well-guarded secrets of medical practice gradually became the commonplaces of our daily living. We owe it to their leaders and, in a lesser degree, to leaders in family social work of thirty years ago, that the great, absent-minded, unheeding public now knows something about health. Any one who has read the 'Life of Sir William Osler' must realize what a fund of common sense and whole-hearted devotion went into the launching of a movement that, in its catholicity and its varieties of approach, seems to me to point the way for the community's better relation to the subject of marriage. This analogy, suggested by the united attack of the health movement, is one to which I shall wish to return a little later. I am no scientist, but I too am having a fifty-second week in my year; I too may want to claim the privilege of letting myself go to the extent of indulging for this once not only in generalization but in prophecy.

After having striven for quite a long time to pick up a few of the loose threads in one small corner of this vast subject of marriage it is a relief to be able to indulge here in one or two general statements. By contrast, therefore, with what might be termed the strictly zoölogical view of marriage, I venture the opinion that marriage always

has at least four outstanding aspects: First, its strictly personal aspect; second, its family aspect; third, its community aspect; and fourth, its public or State aspect.

No one who considers what a varied and complicated thing a human being is will deny the supreme importance of the personal side, ranging as it does through body, mind, and spirit to join two unique personalities in the most intimate social relationship known to us. But this personal side of matrimony and the educational responsibility of families and kinsfolk toward their young people in preparation for it are not my subjects. The State and community aspects, with the boundary line between these two, are going to be more than enough for my portion.

In respect of the State it would seem as true of marriage as of the melodies that are now coming to us over the air through the radio that some degree of public regulation of wave lengths and so on is necessary unless we are to have intolerably competitive discord. If there is to be any real freedom at all in marriage, we must be free to give up some of that freedom in order to enjoy the rest. In the world as we know it certain social obligations are not met at all unless they are met with the help of the community as a whole acting in its collective capacity. This problem of how to make law and public administration serve human welfare in the State's relation to marriage is, as I have indicated, only one aspect of a much larger question, but it happens to be the sub-topic about which I know a little and to which the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation has been devoting attention during the last ten years. These studies are now nearing completion, but I must not attempt to summarize any of their con-

clusions; it would be futile to do so without giving you the findings upon which those conclusions are based. The State's part in the marriage contract is a modest one. Few would deny, however, that it is the duty of the State to protect immaturity from exploitation through premature marriage; or that it should safeguard its citizens against downright fraud in marriage; or against compulsion and duress; or against consanguineous unions and communicable disease. The social order is actually a freer order when it has been 'liberated from the encroachments and confusions of unregulated desires' to that extent. If there were time, I could also give you at least a dozen good reasons why the State should have a permanent official record of every marriage — a record made at the time the marriage takes place.

There is a distinction, however, between the community and the State. The State is only one of the organs of community — a way in which the community organizes itself, as Professor MacIver has taught us. It is not by any means the only way, of course, for the instruments of social control are not confined to municipality or nation; they are multitudinous. The many communities of which we are all members — in so far, that is, as we are capable of participation and interchange of ideas within them — can influence more intimately our ideals and our actual achievements than any generalized and codified public opinion ever does. Of course a process of redistribution of services and functions is forever going on. Certain forms of skilled treatment are taken over sooner or later by the State, while other and especially the newer forms continue to be shaped by small communities within the community and by the communities of interest that stretch far beyond it.

As this communal life grows more diversified, however, there is more not only for the voluntary associations to do but for the State as well; there is more public control and there is more responsibility to be borne by each one of us and also by the host of private agencies through which our associated thinking and doing go forward.

Let me give just one illustration of this — the simplest one. What light do *early marriages* throw upon the boundary line between State and community? As one of our smaller studies, Mr. Hall and I published a book two years ago on 'Child Marriages.' It seemed clear to us that the State had a part to play here in the protection of the immature, that at certain points it must supplement or even take the place of the family; while at certain other points state action must be preceded and followed by voluntary effort.

We have been keeping close watch of marriage legislation of all kinds in this country since 1920, and the number of marriage bills introduced this year was nearly double the number introduced in any other legislative year since we began our count. In 1927 there have been one hundred and thirty-eight such legislative bills of every degree of merit and the reverse. Of this number, twenty-six have now become laws. Without knowing the origin of every one of the twenty-six, we do know that social workers were responsible for at least five of the best of them, while leagues of women voters and State registrars of vital statistics also bore an important part in the legislative changes of certain States.

Pennsylvania made one of the most notable advances of the year. Under the leadership of the Public Charities Association, the social workers of that State actually were able to raise the statutory minimum marriageable

age for girls from twelve to sixteen years. After an unsuccessful campaign two years ago, they made studies, wrote articles, delivered speeches, and conducted the energetic campaign of education which has now ended so successfully. Minnesota has advanced her minimum from fifteen to sixteen years; New York raised hers last year from twelve to fourteen. This could be bettered, of course, but twelve of our States still have the twelve-year minimum. Though New York's fourteen-year limit is still too low, the State has placed an administrative provision on the statute book this year which is probably a new one. The book on 'Child Marriages' contained a whole chapter on proof of age. Following this lead, perhaps, the social workers of New York State, aided by the League of Women Voters, have procured the passage of a law that requires documentary proof of age from all candidates for marriage who are under twenty-one. Candidates who allege they are older, but who appear to the license issuer to be younger, can be required to furnish evidence in much the same form now demanded by many States for the issuance of working papers.

There are a number of other possible provisions as valuable as this one, but untried anywhere as yet, and we hope before long to be able to suggest these further measures to the public for consideration and possible adoption in our different States. After having watched for nearly ten years the difficulties encountered in enforcement, our recommendations are going to be conservative, but we have faith that some of them will be quite as practical as this one about proof of age. The clamor still heard in some quarters for a federal law regulating both marriage and divorce will, we believe, die down soon, for the federal measures thus far proposed

would only weaken the good marriage provisions that many of our States already have without giving any adequate return whatsoever. The federal proposals are administratively unworkable.

But immaturity is only one aspect of early marriage. There is a community aspect of early marriage that the State is not called upon to regulate to anything like the same degree. I refer particularly to marriages between twenty and twenty-five. These may still be called early, and in comparison with marriages contracted at later ages they seem eminently desirable from every point of view. As a nation, we marry earlier than we used to. The health and good comradeship of the married portion of our population has, I believe, been promoted thereby. There is, however, an unfortunate lag among the very group from whom the Nation has a right to expect the most and upon whose preparation for life it has expended the most. I refer, of course, to the professional class.

After President Eliot, standing erect in the dignity and beauty of his ninety years, had addressed the distinguished assemblage in Sanders Theater that gathered there to greet him on his birthday, he also spoke outside in Harvard Yard to the College boys. He urged upon them the importance of not postponing marriage too long. 'Do not wait,' he urged, 'till you think you can offer the girl you want to marry all the luxuries and privileges to which in her father's home she was accustomed. When you have made up your mind, give the girl a chance to tell you hers.' Of course, this stated the situation at its simplest — and it is far from simple — but earlier marriage for college graduates was a favorite theme of his. One wonders sometimes whether our educational standards plus our high standards of comfort and of the con-

ventions are not a good deal to blame for what we find.

For example, two colleagues of mine took the new edition of 'Who's Who' this summer and noted the age at marriage of each man among the first thousand married Ph.D.'s in the book. They found that the average age at marriage of these thousand was 29.5 years, or 29.47 years to be exact. They also found that 48 per cent of the thousand married before their doctorate had been won, and that these 48 per cent actually averaged only 26.75 years at marriage. But how many children did the thousand doctors of philosophy have? All were married and all were old enough to have achieved a certain measure of distinction. Well, they averaged 1.87 children apiece. There is, however, the probability that, though all were requested to report their children, a few did not do so, and I give this figure with somewhat more hesitation than the others. But surely President Eliot was right when he said, as he often did, that college graduates had too few children. The relatively late age at marriage, if it should still hold after an analysis of all the Ph.D.'s in the book has been made, suggests the need of further investigation to discover causes and the remedy if there is one.

This problem is one for the community and not for the State — more especially is it a problem for the educational community and for those in charge of professional education. If, as many educators think, we are wasting the time of students in our secondary schools, wasting several years of it, or if we are postponing the advancement and the highest earning power of the capable professional man unduly, then here are two points at which the founding of new families suffers. It has been urged by the eugenicists that the stocks assumed by

them to be superior should become more productive, and that the so-called inferior stocks — usually of the poor and uneducated — should become less so. The tests, however, that are at present suggested for dividing the sheep from the goats are so many of them far from conclusive, and the chance of improving a biological strain by adopting them is still in the present state of our knowledge so very uncertain, that the educational community would probably be on safer ground if it confined itself to a programme of next steps which will increase social satisfactions and develop a sounder family life for this present generation and the next. This Conference has approached its chosen subject from that point of view. Standing outside the family and looking in upon it, it has asked itself what industry and marriage and leisure and religion were doing to help and to hinder family life to-day. It is from this point of view and for purposes of illustration only that I have ventured to suggest some of the State's and some of the community's relations to early marriage.

But I must not forget that this is my fifty-second week in which, instead of reporting on legislative bills that have been passed or on the statistics of Ph.D. marriages, I have a right to make some good, round, arresting prophecies. I limit myself to just one, and it is this: I prophesy that, just as the health movement has swept the country during the last twenty years, so a new social movement, a new community awakening is very nearly due. Its subject will be marriage, and to achieve social results at all comparable in value with those of the earlier movement, it will have to be as many-sided in its approach, as resourceful in its attack as the effort to make over our health habits has been.

The physicians who shaped the health movement at its

inception were wise men. They built their edifice solidly upon the foundation stones of discovery and organization. While continuing to advance steadily their standards of medical case treatment, they also labored unceasingly at research. And busy though they were, they took pains to interest the laity in their new programme. Above all they recognized the importance of a form of health organization with many parts. Nothing that was essential seemed to them too small and nothing that was an obstacle was too big.

If it were possible to condense into one paragraph the main trends of this country's health development during the last fifty years, that paragraph might suggest by analogy a possible course of development for marriage reform during the next fifty. The relation of the State to health received attention first. None of the early leaders saw the end from the beginning, nor can we, but there were great outstanding evils and possibilities at their doors and they attacked the one, developed the other. If sanitary inspection was the duty of the health wardens and if, in the New York City of those days, the health wardens were usually saloon keepers, they dealt courageously with this particular evil to the no small disgust of the wardens. When they found that many of the physicians were themselves indifferent, they organized a campaign of education among them. If an epidemic of cholera broke out in Europe, they sought the aid of the police power and of the legislature to control not only cholera and smallpox but later yellow fever as well. What they learned in their field laboratories they applied. If the liberty of the individual to acquire and to spread disease had to be interfered with, they interfered with it. And when, still later, the ravages of typhoid and

of tuberculosis had centered the attention of preventive medicine upon water systems and the milk supply, upon housing and other living conditions, they did not hesitate to cross the boundary lines between State and community action and, calling upon the social workers of the country to help them, to utilize such tools, fashioned chiefly by social workers, as the social survey, the social exhibit, and social legislation. It was also at this stage in health developments that so much was achieved in the reform of our State and municipal health departments, and in the extension of the registration area.

But even after all this had been done, the health movement as we know it to-day had arrived no more than halfway. It is interesting to note that topics discussed and rediscussed in the earlier proceedings of public health conventions in this country are scarcely ever mentioned now. The death rate continues to fall, however, as our health forces turn their attention more and more to the *positive content* of health — to re-education of habit, to personal hygiene, and in these later days to mental hygiene. Though all parts of the programme must still be developed and I must not seem to assume that there are no more plague spots for the sanitarians to clear up, the more detailed, man-to-man procedures will probably receive the larger share of our attention from now on. It is evident, however, first, that no one step in the long journey could have been dispensed with; and, second, that every vital aspect of modern life and almost every possible form of community organization has been swept into the health advance at one or another stage of its increasing momentum.

Are we not facing to-day another and equally important set of social conditions — conditions surrounding

the founding of new families that at some points are quite as unhappy as the health situation of fifty years ago? A courage just as high, a willingness to study, to confer, to act with a like degree of humility must be ours to-day, if we are to do more than play at being socially minded. The line of development may not take the same course but I suspect that it will have to. Even if we would, we cannot escape the community aspects of this subject of marriage. Though its more personal side is of vital importance too, the right of the individual to ignore social welfare is a self-destroying right.

It is time now that we asked ourselves — assuming that a new and separate movement for saner, more truly permanent, more socially successful marriage is soon to get under way — what elements in the community are likely to bear an important part in it. Health will bear an essential but not a leading part, I believe. Just as the physicians were foreordained leaders in the conquest of disease, so in a marriage reform movement leadership will probably belong, in the earlier stages at least, to some of those who are already responsible for our formulated marriage policies. These are the legal fraternity, the clergy, the lawmakers, the administrators of the marriage law, the women's organizations of the country, certain of the scientists, and the social workers. I do not pretend to know which one of these groups will be the dominant factor in marriage reform, but each group has something to contribute that the others have not. Historically, the law and the church have borne leading parts in helping to shape our marriage customs. Their increasing recognition of the value of the laity's point of view in other connections encourages one to believe that they

will abandon any closely compartmented procedures in relation to marriage also.

The general public does not yet realize what advances in the art of noting the actual happenings to clients, plaintiffs, and defendants have been made of late by the legal profession and the faculties of our law schools. To name only one instance, a study is now being made, under the leadership of Dean Pound and some of his colleagues, of the courts of Boston. Social workers and others familiar with the life of the city of Boston have been given ample opportunity to contribute their concrete experiences. Five years ago I had occasion to quote to family social workers a statement of Dean Pound's which applies not only to his specialty and to ours but to the problems of marriage as well. He said, 'At whatever cost in dramatic interest or satisfied simplicity of plan, we must insist on plurality of causes and plurality of remedies.' We must indeed. Many failures in marriage legislation and marriage law enforcement in the past are traceable to a combination of rigid tradition with simplicity of plan.

The churches are also beginning to recognize the importance of plurality of causes and of remedies. Recently the Federal Council of Churches appointed a commission to study the subjects of marriage and divorce. This commission is taking the word 'study' seriously, and is seeking coöperative relations with bodies made up of laymen interested in the subject.

Bearing a relation to both Church and State, it is estimated that there are about 130,000 clergymen in this country who are empowered to officiate at marriages. Here we have a small army. If we add to these ministers not only the 30,000 civil officiants at marriages but the 7650 lawmakers who are empowered to pass State mar-

riage laws, and the more than 10,000 marriage license issuers (including their deputies), we have nearly 178,000 of our representatives who are in a position to interpret the State's intent — your intent and my intent — to the citizens of the United States who are about to marry. I have had occasion to know something of the powers and the predispositions of some of this large body of public servants. Heretofore their unrelated activities in the marriage field have been nobody's business in particular, but what has already been done to improve the State's relation to health can also be done to improve its relation to marriage. Many of the 178,000, seeing more than we do of the present somewhat chaotic conditions, are eager to help.

As soon as a movement for marriage reform gets well under way, another factor in it — a much newer one than those already named — will be the women's organizations of the country. No one has ever accused me of being an advanced feminist, but to study the history of marriage legislation is to become convinced that there has been a good deal of very stupid, man-made law on the subject of marriage. Heaven forbid that it should be followed by a lot of woman-made law! What we need is a reconciliation and fusion of the two points of view.

There is going to be no neglect, I trust, of the special sciences that can throw light upon our subject. Though marriage reform will not have so much to learn from science as did health reform, we should be eager to profit by all that biology, anthropology, eugenics, and psychology have to teach us. If there is any science that can help us to be wiser, less credulous, and less sensational in our use of vital statistics, I hope that science will begin to deal with us very soon. The statistics of marriage and

divorce seem to present many temptations to the sensation-mongers.

In this incomplete enumeration of the different communities and professions that may be interested in a movement for marriage reform, it would be foolish to assume any high degree of unanimity among them at the initial stage. There may be sharp differences of opinion at first. But, to quote Whitehead, 'a clash of doctrines is not a disaster — it is an opportunity.' If it stimulates us to study harder and fires us with a desire to examine all the evidence instead of any particular part of it only, the clash will do us good.

A friend of mine, who often reads my manuscripts and gives me the benefit of criticisms, sometimes tart and always tonic, has said of this paper that it takes altogether for granted, and so does not attempt to prove, that marriage is a good thing. I have defended myself by quoting Mr. Homer Folks's dictum of years ago that the people who then came to lecture at schools of social work always began with Adam and made it difficult by so doing to get forward with the subject in hand. It is true that, by and large, I am assuming marriage to be a good thing, just as I am also assuming disease to be a bad thing. But a number of people are so far from thinking disease a bad thing that they deny its existence altogether. Their mistaken attitude has given the health movement a world of trouble; so will the attitudes of certain groups toward marriage, but these need not deflect our attention from our goal.

Our ultimate goal, I take it, is the one suggested by Mr. F. J. Bruno several years ago at a National Conference of Social Work when he said, 'We must help to transform a society which has controlled its behavior by

tradition into one which controls it by intelligent choice.' That statement has seemed to me the keynote of all this series of meetings. The intelligent choices controlling marriage have many of them still to be discovered, but the interest in the subject to-day as a social problem of commanding importance encourages one to hope that not too much time will be wasted in such theoretical and inconclusive speculations as we have just had in the Keyserling book on marriage, for example. What we need is a series of next steps, however short. It is through proceeding to take such steps, in fact, that discovery is made possible.

You may be asking, 'But where do the social workers, and especially the family social workers come in in all this?' I have saved them for the very end, and it is here, unfortunately, where I am most deeply involved, that my gift of prophecy is most likely to fail me. Our best beginning, probably, is to begin where we are. The editor of the Associated Press said recently, 'Humanity is so passionately sure that some new social device will get us out of the present crisis in marriage that it is almost impossible to secure any consideration for an attempt to work the means that we possess.' Beginning where we are involves making the best possible use of our case work experience and improving both the background and the foreground of our records when they deal, as they often do, with marital difficulties. But we should not stop here. It is true that the small group and the individual aspects concern social case workers most nearly, but if there had been time I think I could have convinced you that the successive steps by which I was drawn into the administrative studies that my colleagues and I have been mak-

ing were all social case work steps. As between social reform and social case work, in fact, there is no 'either or' situation but a 'both' situation always. Everything said by Miss Hamilton at this Conference is so profoundly true that it seems to me to establish a social work landmark, but my topic to-day happens to be the other side of our programme.

Social advance is a unit, and, if we study our case work failures carefully, we are only too likely to find that even the most painstaking case treatment often breaks down at the very point where another community resource or group of resources touches the lives of our clients vitally. Unless, therefore, we are able, while remaining loyally devoted to our own specialty, to work from the basis of the whole and to see the multiform interrelations of the whole, we are in grave danger of making the mistake that the French physicians made when they objected to Pasteur's revolutionary discoveries because their concern, as doctors, was not with the disease, but with the individual patient.

In any new social reform, social case work is likely to come in at two important stages. It precedes the large concerted movements and prepares the way for them by bearing faithful witness to the pressure of bad conditions upon individuals and families. But later, it is equally serviceable in applying the new legislative and administrative measures in detail; especially in the initial stages can it bear an important part in helping to make these new measures workable.

If I were going on a long journey and not likely to come back, I think my very last words to my colleagues in family social work, with whom I have had so many good times, would be these: Study and develop your work at its

point of intersection with the other services and social activities of your community. Learn to do your daily tasks not any less thoroughly, but to do them from the basis of the whole and with that background always in mind. After all, society is one fabric, and when you know the resources of your community both public and private, and the main trends of its life rather than any particular small section of it, you are able to knit into the pattern of that fabric the threads of your own specialty. There are eddies and flurries, not to say crazes. Disregard them and let your minds carry through to the practical next steps by which genuine social advance is achieved.

In this matter of marriage — and no larger question, as it seems to me, is likely to demand your attention during the next fifty years — bear faithful, unsensational witness to what is happening in your own State. Instead of seeking any comprehensive, all-at-once remedy either through National or State action, be content at first with short next steps carefully taken and well secured by good enforcement. Work with the administrators of the marriage law, try to understand their difficulties. You ought to find it easy, for some of theirs are yours too. And yet again, and now finally, consider what a wonderfully varied and constructive part is going to be borne later in all this by the many different associations and forms of community that constitute our free society. The goal is so great a one! Prepare yourselves to contribute your characteristic difference to that common stock of insights through which — without a thought of who is to get the credit — there is finally to be achieved as great an advance in marriage reform as we are now achieving in the field of public health.

PART III
WORK, WAGES, AND LEISURE

VI

THE INTEGRITY OF THE FAMILY AS A TEST OF INDUSTRY

A. J. Muste

It is, of course, a commonplace that the development of industrialism has had profound effects on the family. Some of these effects may be regarded as in the long run at least salutary, or at any rate not harmful. Some have been of such a nature that those who have been responsible for the management of industry could hardly be held responsible for their occurrence or amendment. Probably the most fundamental effect of the Industrial Revolution, for example, has been that the family, which for thousands of years in all civilized lands had been the chief unit of production, is ceasing to be so. The producing unit is now, from one point of view, the individual, from another point of view, the factory, or in any case some larger unit than the family. Again, the Industrial Revolution has brought with it the economic independence of women of which a certain writer has said that 'no more radical change in the entire history of the human family has ever happened than that through which we are now passing, based fundamentally upon woman's economic independence'; and adds, 'Costly as was the Industrial Revolution in the hardships it imposed on women, the price paid was not too great for her emergence into independence.'

There is, however, another side of the story. It is still a popular and apparently respectable sport in these United

States to discredit any and all liberal and radical proposals on the ground that they emanate from people who are the enemies of the home and the family, advocates of 'free love,' which always means only one thing, namely, that 'the sky is the limit.' It still needs to be very emphatically pointed out in many circles that, if anybody has been putting bombs under the home and the family during the past century, it is our vaunted industrialism. The indictment is truly a heavy one.

Industrialism has taken the mother out of the home and put her to work in the factory for long hours, often at night, often under positively unsafe and unsanitary conditions, almost invariably under conditions of severe nervous strain. That there has been a serious adverse effect on the bearing of children has now been amply demonstrated by statistics of infant mortality and sickness. From figures of school attendance, juvenile delinquency, and from other sources, we know that forcing women into industry under the conditions indicated has likewise had a most harmful effect upon the rearing of children. Working in the factory at night and seeking to do the housework during the day between snatches of sleep has meant for the mother that she has not known her children, that she has been unfit as a companion for them, frequently has failed in ordinary care for their health, has been careless about school attendance, has turned over the care of babies and young children to the older children, often with the most unfortunate effects upon the physical, emotional, and intellectual development of both the younger and the older children. Factory work for women has meant conflict between woman's economic and her biologic and social functions for which there is no solution under the conditions that

have very generally prevailed in the past and that still prevail, for example, in typical textile communities.

The factory system has brought with it the shameful evil of child labor, the blight of which has by no means been removed from this, the wealthiest nation in all history.

Industrialism has brought the herding of immense populations into close and inadequate quarters, often under conditions shockingly unsanitary, making privacy and the moral habits and attitudes that go with it impossible. The resultant conditions of crowding, noise, lack of sunlight and fresh air, removal from contact with nature, to which human beings in the mass have never before been subjected on such a scale, are certainly in part responsible for the emotional instability and the restlessness of modern populations which have an important influence on family life.

Making all due allowance for advances made under industrialism, it has nevertheless been responsible for exploitation and underpayment of labor and for an unnecessarily low economic standard for the mass of the workers, which have had serious effects on family life. It has brought into existence on a large scale, for the first time, the evil of unemployment, rendering the modern worker insecure — insecure, be it emphasized, though he might be ever so industrious, thrifty, and anxious to work. In this same connection mention should be made of the fact that modern industry requires an exceedingly mobile labor supply. In five years a village expands into a city with the coming of the steel or the automobile industry and workers by the thousand must be found. Elsewhere a flourishing industry may move away or practically disappear because of new inventions. Even where

no great fundamental shifts occur, there are the greatest variations in employment from time to time among the various factories in the same industry or among industries in various sections of the country necessitating a constant shifting about of the labor supply. The most casual reflection on the importance of a certain minimum or permanence and stability for successful family life suggests the effects of these factors of unemployment and mobility of labor supply on the development of the modern family.

To mention but one other count, modern industry has separated men by the millions from the soil and from ownership of the land; it has deprived them of the ownership of their homes; it has separated them from their tools, from the ownership of their tools; it has deprived them of the satisfaction that human beings have obtained for generations from making things and from the exercise of their skill in making them; it has separated the worker from direct contact with the product of his work or direct control over its disposal; it has introduced him into a régime where his destinies seem to be controlled, not by himself and not by the forces of sun, rain, wind, and the seasons, with which man has done battle and held communion for thousands of years, but by other human beings or by vast impersonal, relentless, erratic forces in the presence of which man seems utterly puny and futile and about which he has not been able to throw the kindly mitigation of fairy tale, or religious ritual, or philosophic synthesis — a régime, moreover, in which rewards seem to go quite as often to luck, cleverness, and the speculator's nerve and recklessness as to the sobriety and industry so highly lauded in the copy-books. Now one need not be a sentimental mediævalist, and one may

gladly admit all the necessary qualifications to this indictment of the compensations that the development of industry has brought to mankind, and it will still remain true that the developments we have just mentioned have introduced new factors into human life which have had serious repercussions in many directions and not least in the realm of family life. Certainly the landless, houseless, tool-less, skill-less, religionless, get-rich-quick-if-possible urban worker of to-day is a different specimen from the peasant and the artisan who have made up the bulk of the population in civilized lands since the dawn of history.

If now we turn to ask what the family and its friends may rightfully ask of industry, the answer falls naturally into two parts. In the first place, industry, broadly speaking, is the organization of human work by which we seek to obtain the basic necessities of food, clothing, and shelter to provide that physical basis of life on which all cultural and spiritual development must be built. We may demand that industry be so organized and managed that the masses of men may obtain such a reward from their toil as will enable them to maintain such a standard of living that the cultural values associated with family life may be achieved by them. We may demand this of industry, provided, of course, that the natural resources at our disposal and our command over natural forces are such as to make the goal attainable. For our present purpose, we can safely assume, on the basis of competent testimony, that this is the case.

I suppose it need not be said in an audience of social workers that poverty makes impossible a satisfactory life. One might conclude, however, from some of the utterances of the press and platform, that the problem of in-

voluntary poverty has been solved in America, that all our workers are well-to-do or might easily have a high standard of living if they chose to exert themselves a bit. It is probably true that at no other time in history and at no other place have material standards been as high as they are in the United States at the present time. It is apparently also true that real wages in the United States are higher now than they were a generation ago. There are, however, a number of considerations that must be borne in mind if we are not to get a seriously distorted picture. Statistics given out for popular consumption are often grievously misleading. For example, the weekly wages of a highly paid miner in a good week are given out. Nothing is said about the weeks when his pay was not so good, nor about the thousands of miners who never receive as high a wage, nor about the fact that this miner, if he works in the bituminous fields of Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, and Pennsylvania, for example, is lucky if he has had two hundred days of work in the entire year. Similar misleading statements are often made about the wages in the building trades, railroad, and other industries. Wage studies clearly bring out the fact that, despite the undoubted existence of high daily or weekly wage rates in some trades, the general average of wages ranges between twenty and twenty-five dollars a week, while in such industries as agriculture the sum paid is about ten dollars a week. Needless to observe that this implies that the wages of multitudes of persons and also of multitudes of heads of families are utterly inadequate to maintain a decent standard of living.

It must be borne in mind also that it is impossible to give a cut-and-dried answer to the question, what is a 'subsistence' wage, or a 'decency' wage, or a 'saving'

wage, or a 'cultural' wage, and that what is 'adequate' or 'tolerable' is determined to some extent by subtle psychological factors. For example, every day one encounters sarcastic observations in the papers about the thousands of workers who go to work in flivvers or limousines. Doubtless there are cases of extravagance, though just why ownership of an automobile by a bricklayer should be a fair subject for sarcasm, while ownership of one by a broker is not, is something of a mystery. But how are workers in congested industrial centers to get to work these days except by automobile transportation? Or how shall miners, often compelled to live twenty-five or thirty miles away from the mine, in a district where there are no railroads, street cars, and buses, get to work? And in a day when many are able to ride, is not the individual who cannot provide himself with automobile transportation subjected to an economic handicap in getting and holding a job, and to physical handicaps because of inability to live in a clean and decent neighborhood? What is the use under such conditions of preaching to individuals about extravagance?

A generation ago, a man needed to have the price of car fare to get to work; to-day he needs a flivver. A generation ago a family needed the price of car fare in order to get into the country occasionally; cities have spread out enormously, and to-day in many instances a family needs a flivver in order to get into the country. In what respect is the family with the flivver to-day better off than the family with car fare a generation ago? If it was not immoral to take a street car to work instead of walking, why is it now immoral to drive a flivver to work? If the family of a generation ago without sufficient income to pay car fares suffered real economic, physical,

and social handicaps, does not the family of to-day without sufficient income to maintain a flivver suffer likewise? To put it another way, the various items in a budget or so-called standard of living are tied up with each other and largely imposed on individuals and families by conditions over which they have no control, and seldom, therefore, is anything to be gained by fixing on some specific item as an instance of extravagance or as a subject for preachments.

If from a certain point of view, the American worker is well paid, it is, on the other hand, also true that if you compare the output of the workers to-day with that of the workers of a generation ago, the former are in many instances not so well paid as were the latter. I know personally, for example, of numerous instances in textile mills where workers receive perhaps twice as much in the pay envelope as they did twenty-five years ago, but are producing four, five, and six times as much now as then. It is also true that, if you compare the output of the American workers with that of the European worker, the American worker is not so well paid as is his brother across the seas. I think practically all competent observers would agree that, with our mass production, high degree of specialization, and speeding-up, the American workers are as a general thing subjected to a greater strain than workers in large numbers have ever before experienced. Thus, while high wages may enable the worker to buy material goods and may give him a certain amount of contentment, both of which would appear to be favorable to family life, the American worker doubtless has been a sufferer from discontentment because he has been subjected to severe strain and because his wages seem incommensurate with the efforts he puts forth or at least

with the ever-increasing production of modern industry.

In general, the American worker insists on having for himself and his family many things that were beyond his reach a short time ago and refuses to do without certain goods to which he did not then aspire. There is, of course, an important problem of teaching people, from the 'Four Hundred' down, the distinction between real and fictitious value in the things they buy and live for, but this is not, as is often assumed, a purely working-class problem. American workers, as a whole, do not yet have the food, the clothing, the housing, the leisure, the access to culture and educational opportunity that cannot on any reasonable grounds be denied to human beings, and so the instinctive drive, on the part of the American trade-union movement and of unorganized workers as well, for higher wages with a constantly advancing standard of living is sound, whatever may be the wisest or most socially desirable strategy in any particular wage dispute. And this drive for a higher standard of living ought to have the unqualified support of those interested in the integrity of American family life.

Two or three additional points ought to be made under this head. In the first place, if you take some arbitrary standard as being 'adequate' to support a family of five, you would find, as Professor Paul Douglas has pointed out, that 'to pay such a wage in the English-speaking countries would be more than adequate for between seventy and eighty per cent of the workers, while it would be less than what was needed for from ten to fifteen per cent.' In other words, the problem of the family wage, so-called, arises. To quote Professor Douglas again: 'Should not the real principle be that as needs are not

uniform but variable, so the minimum wage should not be uniform but should vary according to the needs of the worker and his family. In other words, should not the single man receive enough to maintain himself plus a comfortable margin to permit his saving for marriage, but not enough to support a non-existent family of five?' This matter is thoroughly discussed in the work of Paul Douglas referred to and in another work by Eleanor Rathbone, 'The Disinherited Family, A Plea for Direct Provision for the Cost of Child Maintenance through Family Allowances,' and further discussion is not here required. It is certainly a subject which should receive careful attention from social workers.

In this connection reference may also be made to certain other wage proposals which concern not only the individual but more especially the family. One is the minimum wage which, in the present state of public opinion in the United States and of trends in legislatures and courts, is likely to be applied to women only and has a bearing upon the problem of the mother compelled to go to work and who, precisely because she is a mother and has a home and a family on her hands, is often tied down so that she finds only the lowest-paid jobs available. Then there are mothers' pensions which, though paid by the State, nevertheless constitute a demand upon industry and practically constitute wages for the mother. Missouri in 1911 passed the first provision in the United States for a regular allowance to be paid to mothers for the care of their young childern. With only a couple of exceptions, all States have now some sort of mothers' pension law. These laws, however, vary greatly; there is no uniformity in administration, and in most instances the amount paid is exceedingly small.

In the next place, the various forms of social insurance, insurance against sickness, accident, occupational disease, unemployment, old age, constitute a charge upon industry in which the friends of the family should be especially interested. To cite but one or two illustrative and probably familiar facts, of the 500,000 workers who die each year, it is probably true, according to the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, that the death of at least one half is postponable. Assuming an average life value to industry of not less than $5000, and special care for a man chronically ill as $3.00 per day, it is estimated by Mr. Hoover's engineers that the economic loss from preventable disease and death is $1,800,000,000, among those classed as gainfully employed, and nearly $750,000,000 among industrial workers in the more limited meaning of the word. Industrial accidents in the United States annually cause about twenty-five thousand deaths. The total casualties of the American Expeditionary Forces in the World War did not equal the casualties to American workers in peaceful employments during the same period. Another twenty-five thousand American workers are annually made victims of serious permanent disabilities and there are two million temporary disabilities of more than three days' duration. The story of what the visitation of accident, sickness, occupational disease, unemployment, and unprovided-for old age mean in workers' homes is, alas, all too familiar to all of you. The suffering falls, of course, in countless instances upon individuals and families who share only in an infinitesimal degree in responsibility for the condition which brought it about. In a good many instances, management might have provided safeguards or given instructions that would have prevented trouble, but failed to do so because it

may be cheaper for a particular employer or industry, in the short run at least, to cut off a worker's arm, throw him on the scrap heap, and hire another man than to prevent the accident. Now when we have conditions for which society seems to be responsible, but from which the individual suffers, common sense, a regard for efficiency and humanity will all seem to dictate that society must not only take preventive measures, but, by means of a scheme of insurance, must ease the burden on the individual and on the innocent sufferers. Our own experience with compensation legislation and the experience of other countries with other forms of social insurance seem amply to have demonstrated the soundness of this procedure. Yet we still refuse to face our duty in this regard in the United States and permit the continuance of the blighting of individual lives and the breaking-up of homes because of the casualties of industry. A thorough study of the whole problem of social insurance must certainly be a primary concern of all social workers who desire to deal realistically, scientifically, and adequately — and not only sentimentally and on the basis of an outworn individualism — with the problem of maintaining the integrity of family life.

Provision for rent or home ownership, which is an important item in the worker's budget, also requires special attention, at least in many of our larger cities. The number of persons owning their own homes free from debt is, I understand, decreasing in cities of one hundred thousand and over. Rents are soaring. Evidence accumulates that private enterprise cannot be depended on to provide homes at rentals that unskilled and semi-skilled workers can afford. In dealing with this, however, we are backward in comparison with Europe, and American public opinion is still indifferent to bad housing.

This, in the first place, then, is required of industry if it is to meet the test of making possible the integrity of family life — such compensation for the workers as shall give all of them a reasonable supply of food, clothing, and shelter, and access to leisure and to recreational, educational, and cultural opportunity. This compensation should, by some form of social insurance, be guaranteed against the hazards of motherhood, unemployment, accident, sickness, occupational disease, and old age. And, unless there be a surplus, so as to make such provision unnecessary, this compensation should also be adjusted to the needs of the family with children by means of some such device as the family wage, in order that marriage and the rearing of children may not be subjected to an unsurmountable handicap in an age when the family is no longer the normal unit of production and when it may be doubted whether marrying and begetting children is not an economic liability rather than an asset as it was in the past.

The second main requirement that those who are concerned about the integrity of the family will make of industry is that the conditions under which people work shall be such that personality is developed, not stunted, that workers shall not go from the factory so exhausted physically, so thwarted emotionally, so dulled intellectually, as to be unfit to participate in and contribute to a fine rich family life. Let us list some of the more important items in a programme to secure this result:

1. It implies reasonable hours of work, and reasonable may be safely taken to imply shorter hours than now prevail. There will be no one, I assume, in such an audience as this, to question, on the old ground that work is a great blessing and we cannot get too much of it, the advisa-

bility of reducing hours of labor. Work that is freely chosen, that is interesting in itself, that calls upon creative energies, is a precious good and human beings can stand a vast deal of it. We shall not find them campaigning for shorter hours for such work. Factory work is for the most part not freely chosen, not very interesting in itself, nor calling upon creative energies. It must be borne in mind also that even when the worker finds it interesting, it is usually carried on under conditions of noise, heat, humidity, dust, monotony, speeding-up, artificial light, indoor confinement to which human beings have never been subjected in the past, and which the human form is certainly not able to endure in indefinite quantities. If the effects upon the body, especially the nervous system of the individual, are not to be so deleterious as to render workers unfit for normal family life, hours of labor must be shortened.

We should note that, although a substantial shortening of hours of work has taken place, the amount is in many instances probably not so great as appears on the surface. For one thing, the distance people have to travel in order to get to work has in many cases increased, so that a miner, steel worker, or building tradesman who puts in forty-eight hours per week at the shop frequently consumes an additional ten hours per week or more in getting to and from work. For another thing, shortening of hours of labor has in many instances been accompanied by a speeding-up of machinery and labor and an intensification of the drive for output.

2. The physical conditions in the factory must be made safe, sanitary, and so far as possible conducive to health. This involves safety devices for machinery, adequate protection against fire hazard, scientific lighting, ade-

quate ventilation, sanitary toilets, clean and pleasant lunch-places, rest-rooms, seats wherever possible, elimination of unnecessary noise, dirt, dust, and humidity, and similar measures. Happily tremendous progress has been made along these lines in recent years, and that progress is perhaps in no small degree responsible for our falling death rate. Much more, however, might be done, especially, as already suggested, in provisions for safety and against industrial accidents and occupational disease.

3. For the sake of the home, night work for women should in many occupations be eliminated. Care must be taken not to hamper the economic independence of women by limiting their choice of occupations unnecessarily. It would be similarly undesirable to handicap the married woman as compared with the single woman in choice of occupations. As things stand, however, night work for wives and mothers in factories is so serious an evil, both from the biological and social standpoint, that those who are concerned primarily about the family are certainly justified in seeking to eliminate all such work by direct industrial action or by legislation, even at the risk of inflicting hardships on certain individuals. It is by no means clear that, if the exploitation of women in night work in factories is eliminated, this will permanently involve any limitation upon opportunities for work for women.

4. The dilemma to which reference has just been made suggests that some research and experimenting might be done to explore the possibilities of devising part-time occupations for married women. Something is being done along this line for college-trained women, but the need of the working-class wife or mother for a part-time job is often much more real. Doubtless factory managers will

at first object that the shifting about required, if jobs are to be provided for a part of the day or for certain days of the week for some women, will prove uneconomical. This may be doubted, for what we have now is a constant turnover in factories where women are employed and frequent absences for part of a day or week or longer periods. Such handicaps to efficient production might be much reduced if an attractive programme for part-time jobs could be worked out.

5. Child labor in factories should be entirely eliminated. According to a recent census, there are still two and a quarter million children between seven and fifteen in the United States not in school. In many places where the laws are good, they are not enforced. The responsibility, it seems to me, rests clearly upon employers as a class. So long as they offer economic inducements in order that they may exploit the labor of children, the individual family under the stress of a bitter struggle for existence is often powerless to resist. Social workers as a class very heartily support child labor legislation and its enforcement, and well they might. As Dr. E. R. Groves has recently put it, 'Child labor is not a necessity in any form of industry, but the prolonging of childhood so that every normal individual can be given a suitable education for a fair start in life is a basic requirement for home-making.'

6. The problem of turnover of labor merits attention. Some years ago employers generally were a good deal concerned about the turnover because it seemed costly to be constantly breaking in new hands. My impression is that interest in the subject has somewhat flagged of late, and if this is true it would be interesting to know the reason. I have been told that in the various automobile

factories, for example, operations are now so highly specialized and simplified that a man can go from one factory to another as well as from one operation to another with only the slightest temporary loss in efficiency, and that a constant shifting about of automobile workers is actually taking place on a very large scale. However that may be, the turnover in American industry is still very large. The thing gears in with the problem of the family at many points. The young worker who moves about frequently is less likely to contemplate marriage and the establishment of a home. The man who wants to desert his family finds it comparatively easy to do so. On the other hand, the absence from home caused by moving to a job in another town may lead to desertion where family ties are somewhat insecure and income precarious. Constant moving about from job to job is itself a symptom either of a psychological maladjustment that creates economic and social problems or of a faulty economic and social condition bound to result in psychological maladjustment.

7. The application of the findings of modern psychology to the problems of industry in vocational guidance for the young, development of physiological, psychological, and educational tests, personnel work, adaptation of the job to the man and the man to the job, fatigue study, study of the effect of various occupations and processes upon workers, study of incentives in industry, methods of wage payment, and so on, is a recent development and one that holds untold possibilities in which the social worker will have the profoundest interest. Labor has at times assumed a hostile or suspicious attitude toward some of these developments, and in so doing has, perhaps, displayed more scientific caution than special-

ists who are blind to some of the remoter bearings of their own work, or their employers or managers who are prepared to give a swift and greedy welcome to any scientist promising to solve the labor problem, to secure contented workmen and big production records. Certainly there are dangers to be guarded against. Yet in general we have reason to feel that in the industrial psychologist those who are concerned about the integrity of the family have a real ally.

8. Mention of the industrial psychologist and of the labor movement leads me to certain broader considerations which have already been hinted at, which seem to me of paramount importance and which I venture to stress in closing. For one thing I suppose that no careful observer of modern life, though banishing sentimentalism and pessimism from his mind as rigidly as possible, would describe industrial workers as happy. We think of them as restless, feverish, more or less vaguely discontented. In this connection I came across a remark of Dean Inge's the other day in the introduction to his book, 'England.' 'I am disposed to think that this sudden transplantation of the countryman within three or four generations into the unnatural surroundings of the towns has more to do with social unrest than is usually supposed. The obsession of ill usage which generates the revolutionary temperament seems to occur almost exclusively among the town workers. In material comforts they are better off than ever before, but they suffer from a chronic malaise which makes them hate all the conditions of their lives. The town worker does not consciously recognize the call of the country, he only feels the aching of racial habits thousands of years old and now suddenly thwarted.' I am inclined to agree with the Dean in this observation.

If there be weight to it, it is of importance to us in many ways. It means, for example, that we have to make it possible for the city dweller to get into the country regularly and frequently. Is not the insistence of the city man that he must have his car and get into the open spaces, even though he must sacrifice adequate housing and provision for a rainy day, perhaps the following out of an imperious but sound instinct and not an insane impulse as is frequently supposed? It means that reasonably priced housing in the suburbs is a matter for urgent concern. Also we have here a factor which I think has more to do than is commonly supposed with the more spectacular outbreaks of industrial unrest, such as great strikes of unskilled and semi-skilled, usually unorganized, workers, and certain activities of revolutionary political groups. A big mass strike is a glorious, emotional release after long subjection to emotional thwarting and strain. It is in the same category as a red-hot revival, a lynching bee, a drunken spree, a mediæval children's crusade. It is, in other words, the symptom of a condition, and there is nothing to be got by being shocked at it or afraid of it, by preaching against it, by denouncing its leaders, by clubbing women and children on the picket line — in the early stages of a strike they like to be clubbed and the police get an equally big 'kick' out of the clubbing. Sensible people who are interested in the family, and who know what havoc a great strike plays with family life, will minister impartially to the victims just as they would in the case of a war, a riot, or an epidemic, and above all they will face, study, and remove the condition of which the strike is a manifestation.

Again, dealing with the matter from the standpoint of efficiency in production, Mr. H. D. Harrison, a British

authority on industrial psychology, says: 'Envy and resentment are feelings which are quite incompatible with that smooth running of the industrial machine necessary for a high standard of output, but these are feelings which are daily being aroused under the present autocratic system of industrial organization.' He goes on to quote from Mr. Sydney Webb's 'The Works Manager of To-day': 'We shall never get the maximum production out of our industrial establishments so long as these are run, and are known to the operatives to be run, not for the benefit of the persons who do the work, not even for the benefit of the community as a whole, but for the benefit of a class of functionless landlords and shareholders to whom we have, by the laws that we have made and by the social system that we maintain, chosen to give the privilege of levying a tribute on our labor equal in the aggregate, in the United Kingdom and the United States, to something like one third of the product. . . . So long as we persist in keeping three fifths of the producers no better than horses (and many of them far worse than horses), whilst ten or twenty thousand "captains of industry" insist on claiming for their really indispensable services, out of the common product, each of them perhaps fifty or a hundred times as much as the craftsman's standard rate, there will be (as of course there ought to be) industrial unrest.'

We know that envy and resentment and personal and social unrest are also quite incompatible with the right functioning of family life. But whether they are themselves aware of it or not, thousands of industrial workers do feel this envy and resentment, and if we are really concerned about the integrity of family life and not merely about charitable ministrations to the victims of broken

family life, we shall not be able to evade consideration of these broader problems of the distribution of the product of industry and the democratization of ownership and management.

And that suggests a final observation. The industrial worker suffers from lack of opportunity to express himself, to release himself, to assert himself in certain ways to which he was for generations accustomed. For example, the satisfaction that comes from tilling land and raising a crop on it, from being skillful with tools, from making a useful or beautiful thing, from disposing of the product of his toil and his skill, from direct wrestling with Nature, and so on. He frequently cannot express himself in these ways in the modern factory. He cannot as an individual control his own destiny in the huge industrial machine that we have developed. How then is he going to save his soul and his self-respect and so be an integrated being who among other things may be expected to function normally in the family? It is not enough to say that we shall shorten hours and give a man all the chance he wants to express himself in his leisure time. It is going to be some time before the hours will be short enough to compensate for all the thwarting incident to factory conditions, and, besides, a man who remains a hopeless cog in the machine in so important a matter as his functioning in the economic process on which after all power is based is not likely to be a whole and healthy individual. Now what has happened is that industrial workers have been creating and shaping a social agency through which they can exercise some control over their destinies, through which they do recover a measure of self-respect and achieve a certain opportunity for self-expression. That agency is the labor movement; primarily the trade

unions, eventually the labor political party, coöperative enterprises, labor banking, labor education, and so on. It is indeed a most imperfect agency, it has made numerous mistakes, but some one, I believe, once remarked of the Church that it must be divine or it could not possibly have survived all the mistakes it had committed. At all events, it should be clear by this time that the labor movement cannot be fought out of existence and it cannot kill itself by its own mistakes, for it is the one democratic agency in the industrialism that dominates our modern life, the chief means for expression for the industrial worker. As such it serves a profound psychological need even for unorganized workers, which explains more than anything else perhaps why men will fight and die for it.

Now the development of such an agency for self-expression and self-determination in the midst of a social order becoming ever more complex, impersonal, and centralized would seem to be a consummation so devoutly to be wished that all men and women of good will would heartily encourage it. Whether democracy can at all survive against what sometimes seems to be a very rapidly rising tide of dictatorship depends chiefly, I believe, upon the maintenance and growth of this agency of democracy in industry. For this reason I have made no reference to certain provisions by employers for recreation, education, welfare work, and so on, of which much is often made, though I am by no means insensible to the lofty motives that in certain instances animate these activities, because I believe that it is of the utmost importance that workers should develop these services for themselves coöperatively rather than have them handed down to them charitably or, worse, as a substitute for adequate wages or a means for attaching the employee to

the personal service of the employer. And because providing the worker with a real avenue for self-expression and self-determination is so necessary if he is not to be a thwarted individual, if he is to be an individual capable of entering into the finer relations of family life, I have hoped that social workers might more and more regard it as one of their chief responsibilities to understand and encourage the labor movement and that there might spring up between the labor movement and the various agencies of social work a more intelligent and efficient coöperation than has hitherto obtained.

VII

THE CHANGING BASIS OF FAMILY SUPPORT AND EXPENDITURE

PAUL H. DOUGLAS

I

THE nature of the family, like that of every other human institution, has largely been shaped by the economic conditions of the time. Its form changes in part as the ways in which men make a living change, and it in turn helps to shape economic institutions themselves. One great change has come with modern industrialism — namely, the fact that the men and women who are gainfully employed now make their living as individuals and not as members of a family group. In a pastoral society this, of course, is not so. The need for many shepherds, for protection and for insurance, leads to the patriarchal family with its attendant subordination of the women and the younger men. Over most of the earth agriculture is even to-day managed on a family basis. The labor of husband, wife, and children all dovetail, and the goods which are thus produced are shared by all. As long as manufacturing is primarily carried on in the home, as is the case under the domestic or putting-out system, the family still remains the dominant producing agent. In such societies as these, it is virtually impossible for a woman to make a living by herself. In order to survive she must attach herself to some family. The lot of a spinster is hard; to avoid it women are forced to make

early marriages, and, once married, there is little or no opportunity for them to escape from uncongenial relationships. But in the highly differentiated societies which the factory system brings in its wake, men and women are employed outside the home as individuals. The factory, the railroad, the office, and the large store are not enterprises which are carried on by men and women bound together by a common blood tie and by a common home, but by people whose associations need not extend beyond their working hours, and who earn their living purely as individuals. In Western civilization, therefore, the family has virtually disappeared as the producing unit.

It still remains, however, as the dominant consuming unit. While an increasing per cent of the money income of the world is being spent by individuals upon themselves, probably the major portion is still expended collectively by some representative of the family to satisfy the group needs of its members.

But there are many who believe that the family, as such, will largely disappear as the consuming unit as well, and that men and women will in the future live together as individuals rather than as members of a family group. It is obvious that there are many forces which are operating in this direction. The possibility of being paid for their work as individuals and thus of maintaining themselves has enabled multitudes of women to escape from distasteful family relationships. Young men and women are able to leave their own families at an earlier age than formerly, and women have been given an alternative to marriage. They are thus not driven into such forced marital relationships as when they were afraid of becoming despised spinsters, seeking sanctuary in the homes of

their fathers and their brothers. Industrialism has therefore on the whole raised the age of marriage.

It has also, of course, increased divorce. It is not alone the typewriter which has given to women that 'twelve-pound look' which Barrie has described. The ever-widening range of employments makes it possible for wives to leave their husbands and to dissolve relationships which have become irksome. Nor is it as necessary now, as for Barrie's women, previously to have accumulated the twelve pounds. The woman worker need not bring capital with her — she need only bring herself. It is primarily for this reason that divorce is much higher in the cities than in the rural districts.

Just as the opportunities for trade and for handicraft production made of mediæval cities islands of freedom amidst a sea of serfdom to which bondsmen might flee for liberty, so the industrialism of our modern cities has made of them places of refuge and of adventure to which women, and to a lesser degree young men, may flee from the real or fancied tyranny of parental control and from many of the compulsions of forced matrimony. The increasing ability of women to stand economically upon their own feet has in turn made men more willing to break off marriage ties. To cast a woman adrift in an agricultural society is indeed to abandon the helpless. Chivalry and social pressure therefore combined to make at least the economic maintenance of one's wife an obligation which none can violate with impunity.

But this obligation is lessened when women can largely support themselves, with the result that men as well as women can now seek freedom from marriage. Some of the effects which the entrance of women into industry, on approximately the same terms as men, may have on

marriage are strikingly evidenced by the developments in Russia, where I am writing these lines. Divorce is possible not only by mutual consent, but virtually at the will of either party, subject only to the provision that if either party later becomes economically dependent, then the other is liable for support up to one third of his or her income. A man, therefore, cannot safely be divorced more than twice. The forces which have led to this change are primarily the growth of industrialism and the increased protection which the new régime has provided for children as compared with that of the old government. It is, of course, too soon to appraise all of the consequences of this extraordinary experiment, but there is quite general agreement that it has caused the peasants and the workmen to be more solicitous for the welfare of their wives lest otherwise they should lose them. Wife-beating, for example, is no longer as common as it formerly was, since the wives can now leave their husbands and go to the cities for work. The desire of the men to retain an unpaid worker forces them to be more humane in their treatment of their wives. Women have therefore gained not only greater freedom, but better treatment.

While the future may well bring to us a greater rate of change in family relationships, it is idle to believe that the family as such will either disappear or that its importance will be greatly lessened. If the worst were to come to the worst and the most divisive of the tendencies of the modern world were to realize themselves, then it would still be true that a series of temporary marriages would nevertheless be marriages. The attraction which men and women feel for one another and their desire for comradeship is such that the maintenance by them of

any large proportion of separate households is extremely unlikely.

The gloomy prophets of the dissolution of marriage err most in forgetting the powerful forces which operate toward the permanency of relations between men and women. Such critics generally forget the simple fact that even in an age of birth control, children are still the normal consequence of marriage. Now the care of children is, with all its difficulties, one which most parents will not willingly confide to any institution. It brings with it joys which the vast majority of men and women will not forego, and it constitutes the most vital tie which permanently binds the interests of men and women together. It is well for the children that this is so, for the experiments of a half-century of child-placing have demonstrated that even the mediocre foster home is better for children than the scientifically managed institution. If this is true in the case of orphans, how much more is it true where the affections of the parents do not start from scratch, but where there is an initial love and where the daily identification of similarities between themselves and their children constantly enhances the feeling of identity. The belief, therefore, in the complete superiority of institutional over home care, which I find many of the Russian Communists hold, seems ill-advised. When to all this is added the greater psychic stabilization of the emotional life of children which permanent as opposed to shifting parental relationships bring, the necessity for as great a permanence of the family as is consistent with other ends is evident. There is need, therefore, as Count Keyserling remarks, for the solemn realization that the family is an agency for the fulfillment of a social duty to the generation which is to press upon us, and not some-

thing to be assumed or discarded as one's desires may happen to determine.

Happily also there are other forces than the love and care of children which operate in favor of permanence. In the first place, if one may inject material considerations at this point, it is economical. There are coöperative economics of consumption in family life, and a series of shifting alliances is a luxury which only the well-to-do can afford. From the standpoint of society, moreover, any decrease in the permanence of the relations between men and women would result in a great increase in those self-regarding expenditures which courtship always entails, and which constitute a drain upon the material resources and vital energies of a world where the economic basis of the good life has not been assured as yet to the great masses of mankind.

In the second place, it is frequently overlooked that men and women hunger for permanence in their relationships with each other as well as for change. In a world in which the physical composition of matter is ceaselessly in flux, and where human institutions and relationships change with what at times seems almost kaleidoscopic rapidity, the human heart seeks to find some resting place and some state of permanent equilibrium in the midst of the pressures and strains which beat in upon it. This is the mutual need which marriage serves.

I would apologize for mentioning these perfectly obvious forces, were it not for the fact that large groups of our society, including many of our intellectuals, seem to have forgotten them; for matters of marriage and of the family, therefore, the saying of Dr. Johnson that 'men need not so much to be informed as to be reminded' seems preëminently appropriate, and justifies what would otherwise have been taken for granted.

We are faced, then, with the fact that the family as a consuming unit will, in all probability, continue indefinitely, but that in the future increasingly large numbers of men and women will earn their living as individuals. This dichotomy between income and expenditure, between the individualistic ways in which people earn their living and the largely combined way in which they must expend it, if the family is to be maintained, gives rise to many interesting problems, which I shall now try to explore.

II

The individualization of the ways in which those who work outside the home receive their money income has made it difficult for families adequately to support themselves. It is not merely necessary that the total earnings of the members of the family should be sufficient to maintain the group, but it is also necessary that they should turn a sufficient amount over to the wife or mother for her to expend for the needed collective purposes. The turning over of one's pay check intact is a virtue which the wives of working men have come to regard as the test of a proper husband, and which they try to enforce by every means in their power. So ardent is this desire that it even gives rise amongst our immigrant population to folk-myths as a weapon of enforcement, as Jane Addams has so charmingly shown in her story of the devil-baby at Hull House.

But this control by the wives is by no means perfect. Many husbands deduct considerable sums from their pay and spend it for their own purposes. This is particularly easy to do in a period when money earnings are changing rapidly, and when it is difficult for wives to keep track of

what their husbands are really earning. Many husbands, while turning over their pay to their wives, will almost immediately borrow back from them inordinate sums for personal expenditures. Furthermore, even the steadiest of husbands generally feel that any bonus earnings which they secure over and above their basic wage belong to them and not to their families. Piece-rate workers frequently request that their bonus earnings be paid them in separate envelopes in order that their wives may not know how much they are earning.

If there are difficulties in getting husbands to contribute to the common fund, they are on the whole much less than those in getting employed children to contribute. The girls are of course more docile than the boys, and frequently give a larger fraction of their earnings to their mothers than do their fathers. Where they are superconscientious, they all too often stint themselves to protect their younger brothers and sisters. When they are pleasure-loving, however, they frequently absorb most of their earnings for their own purposes. As all know, however, the sons will make fewer sacrifices. Accustomed as most males are to regard themselves as the center of the universe, they tend to be unwilling to sacrifice themselves for the family group as a whole. If great pressure is put upon them by their parents, they can always leave home and keep their earnings entirely for themselves. They are held in the home by the coöperative economies which they largely secure from the unpaid labors of their mother, and for which they would have to pay outside, and also by affection, but if they are forced to contribute so much that it is economically disadvantageous for them to remain, then their family affection is subjected to a severe strain, and a large percentage will leave. The fact

that this alternative is always open to them, and to a lesser degree to the daughters as well, operates in turn to moderate the demands which their parents can make upon them.

The result is that the young, particularly the unmarried, men live upon a much more expensive scale than others of their economic class. It is primarily they who buy the silk shirts, patronize the pool-rooms, and attend the prize-fights and baseball games. A very large part of the luxurious expenditure of the nation is indeed made by them.

The fact that men get accustomed when bachelors to these expenditures makes it very difficult for them to economize properly once they are married and when two or more persons must share approximately the same income. The result is that a considerable proportion of these expenditures are continued by the husband and father while the income available for the rest of the family is appreciably reduced.

These forces operate, therefore, to prevent the basic needs of many families from being met, even though the money income of its members would, if pooled, be sufficient to meet their needs. The weight of the burden, of course, is thrown upon the wives and younger children. The most overworked and exploited members of our society are the working-class mothers of two or more children. They in general cut their consumption of food and clothing far below the level of decency and efficiency. Their working day is much longer than that of their husbands and their employed children and has few of the diversions which they enjoy. We have properly been concerned, during the last two decades, with the protection against exploitation of the women who work in stores and

factories. But because of their isolation, we have tended to forget the lot of mothers in the home, and to ignore the fact that the kitchen stoves and the washtubs of the home are in practice worse tyrants than the spindles and punch-presses of industry. The protection of these almost forgotten women is one of the most pressing problems of social reform, and is all the more baffling because since they are not employed for wages, no such direct frontal attack can be made in the form of legislation concerning hours as is possible in the case of their gainfully employed sisters.

But there are many cases where the wages of the family, even if properly expended, are insufficient to meet the vital needs of its members. In industry, workers are paid according to their assumed productivity, and without regard to their needs. If a bachelor is as efficient as the father of a family, then the competition of the market tends to give him as high a wage. The result is that the average earnings of unskilled labor, which, even with no loss from unemployment, cannot exceed eleven hundred dollars a year, are insufficient to maintain even one dependent child, and greatly less than the amount needed to support two or more such children. The families of the semi-skilled workers are only slightly better off. There is therefore a large group of our children who are growing up under cramped conditions which will permanently handicap them.[1]

[1] Dr. Leila Houghteling's study of the *Income and Standard of Living of Unskilled Laborers in Chicago* shows that the earnings of seventy per cent of the heads of families with children to support were insufficient to maintain those actually dependent upon them on a scale of living recommended by the local social agencies for dependent families. In forty-five per cent of the cases the total income of the families, including the money derived from boarders, lodgers, and the work of mothers, was insufficient to attain this level.

Most of the proponents of the living wage principle have sought to meet this difficulty by proposing that all adult male workers shall be paid enough to support a family of five, which for some occult reason they have assumed as the standard or normal sized family. But this is a wrong method of accomplishing a right end. The occupation statistics of England, the United States, and Australia all demonstrate that slightly over one-quarter of the adult males who are gainfully employed are bachelors. They certainly do not have wives and children to support, and it costs them less than half as much to live upon the same scale as it does a family with three dependent children. To pay them enough to support such a family would therefore be to give them a surplus greatly in excess of their needs for a basic minimum even with an allowance of a saving for matrimony. Approximately one-quarter of the male workers, moreover, while married, do not have any children dependent upon them for support, and hence would also enjoy a considerable surplus. Approximately another thirty per cent of the workers have one or two children to support, and hence do not need as much as the family of five. Thus eighty per cent of all the males have less than four persons dependent upon them while only slightly less than ten per cent actually have the family which we have been told is the standard. The single men and those with small families have been tacitly willing, if we may mix our metaphors, to fight behind the skirts of their married brethren but they should no more be allowed to plead the existence of other people's children as a reason for increasing their own wages than street beggars to borrow children who do not belong to them in order to make their own appeal to charity more effective.

Ten per cent in turn have more than three children dependent upon them, and would still be insufficiently provided for were all to be paid the family-of-five wages. These ten per cent, significantly enough, have from thirty-five to forty per cent of the children to support. To pay to all workers enough to support a family of five would thus be exactly to meet the needs of only one tenth of the workers, to pour vast surpluses into the pockets of eight tenths, and still to stint another tenth. Since there were, in 1920 28,200,000 adult male workers, slightly over 6,000,000 of adult women who were gainfully employed, and about an equal number of employed juveniles, to pay to the males enough to support five persons each would be to provide them with maintenance for 141,000,000 persons. But since the total population of the country in that year was less than 106,000,000 and since the women and juveniles certainly on the whole earn enough to support themselves, there were not more than 94,000,000 persons, including the men themselves, who had to be supported by the male workers. To pay the family of five wage to all would, therefore, have been to provide for 47,000,000 fictitious persons. This burden of supporting so many non-existent wives and children would be too heavy for many industries to bear, so that even in prosperous America it is in fact doubtful whether it would be economically possible for the family-of-five wage to be universally applied.

We would seem then to be confronted with a dilemma: since payment is made according to production, and since the composition of families varies greatly, how then is it possible for us to adapt our wage system in such a way as to provide an economic sufficiency for the children of the oncoming generation. Clearly, in order to protect

the families properly, it is necessary to see to it that the mothers are provided with additional sums according to the number of children they have. But if this were made a burden upon industry, the natural consequence would seem to be that the employers would discharge first those who had several children to support, and to whom they consequently would have to pay appreciably more than the general average. These men would therefore tend to be unemployed, with the result that their families would be in a worse situation than before. But this difficulty can in reality be overcome in either one of two ways. Either the allowances for the children can be paid by the State from funds raised through taxation, or they can be made a charge upon a group of employers and distributed in such a way as to prevent any inducement to discriminate against giving employment to men with families. The former method is best illustrated by the recent New Zealand act which makes a grant from the State funds of approximately $2 a month for every child beyond the second whose parents do not have an average weekly income of $19.50.[1] The French *caisses de compensation* and the 1927 law of New South Wales illustrate two forms of the latter method. Thus in France, there are now over 210 such funds, joining together in voluntary union more than 14,000 employers who employ more than 1,400,000 wage-earners. Here the allowances paid by the concerns who are members of a *caisse* are charged against the members as a whole. They in turn pay their contributions according to several bases such as (1) the relative number of workers employed; (2) the relative number of man-

[1] For a short description of this measure see R. M. Campbell, 'Family Allowances in New Zealand,' *Economic Journal*, September, 1927 (vol. xxxvii), pp. 369–83.

hours worked; (3) the relative amount paid out in wages. Thus if a fund which included 200 firms and 100,000 workers were to pay allowances for 120,000 children, of $200 each, the total charge would be $24,000,000. If this were divided according to the numbers employed, the assessment per worker would amount to $240. The employer would pay this amount for the bachelor as well as for the man with eight children, and hence would have no inducement to discriminate in favor of the former.

The payment of these allowances and membership in the funds is voluntary in France, but an act by the Parliament of New South Wales which was passed in March of this year makes them obligatory and universal in that State.[1] Weekly payments of five shillings for each child are made from the State funds to all families, whether wage earners or self-employed, whose incomes do not exceed that of the basic wage. This is in turn set at the cost of maintaining man and wife and not, as formerly, a family of four. To help meet the cost of paying these allowances to the wage-earners, the employers are required to pay a given percentage of their wages bill, at present three per cent, to this central State fund. The act covers approximately 400,000 children and it is estimated that it will entail an annual expenditure of approximately $20,000,000.

It is only through some such system as this that our modern family can be protected by industry. Any such proposal, however, naturally encounters opposition from many sources, of which the two following are the most important: (1) Those who fear that it would cause a great increase in population. Such critics point to what they suppose was the effect of the Speenhaemland system

[1] Act No. 39, 1927.

of poor relief in England, which made grants according to the number of dependents, although recent studies have shown that the application of the Speenhaemland system was followed by a decline in the birthrate, and not by the increase which Malthus and Ricardo fancied that they observed.[1] The rise in living standards which such payments would cause would set into play forces limiting births, and if this were not sufficient, then the allowances for children beyond say the third or fourth could be diminished.

(2) A second group of opponents are those who fear that it would be used to depress the wages of the single men, and to weaken the position of the unions. That the single men at present have a surplus above the level of their class is undeniable, so that if the existing total wages-bill were to be rationed according to need, then their surplus should be distributed among the families with dependents. If such allowances were paid by the State, it would probably result in those who receive them offering their services at a somewhat lower base rate than before, and hence would deflate the wages of the unmarried males. If such allowances were to be installed almost simultaneously by industry as a whole, it would be possible to pay most, if not all, of the allowances by a reduction in the base rate or, as in France, by not increasing the base rate as rapidly as the advance in living costs. If it were introduced gradually, however, it would be impossible for an industry appreciably to reduce the wages of single men, lest they should go elsewhere and leave the employers with an undue ratio of dependents to workers. Since this system

[1] See the interesting and virtually conclusive paper by Blackmore and Mellonie, 'Family Endowment and the Birth-Rate in the Early Nineteenth Century,' *Economic History Supplement* to the *Economic Journal*, May, 1927, pp. 205–13.

will probably only spread in America by gradual degrees, this fear is not well grounded. Unions, moreover, may by incorporating such provisions in their collective agreements at once secure joint control of the system and prevent the money wages of the bachelors from being reduced.

It is indisputable, however, that even though such payments do not decrease the actual money sums going to bachelors, they will result in a different distribution of funds as between those who have and those who do not have dependents from what would otherwise be the case. But this is as it should be. There is need not only for changes in the vertical distribution of income as between rich and poor but also for changes in the horizontal distribution as between those who have children to support and bachelors and childless couples. Socialists and labor sympathizers have been reluctant to admit the necessity for this second type of change lest it impair the solidarity of the working class, but from a human point of view it also is necessary. Such a system of family allowances, particularly if paid to the mother in the home and not to the father in the workshop, would go far to enable the family as a consuming unit to meet the economic strains which the separation of production from the household has brought upon it.[1]

[1] I have treated this proposal at greater length in my *Wages and the Family*. See also Eleanor Rathbone's *The Disinherited Family* and *The Ethics and Economics of Family Endowment*, and M. Stocks's *The Case for Family Endowment*. For an attack upon the proposal see Alexander Gray's *Family Endowment*.

VIII

TOWARD THE REDISCOVERY OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN INDUSTRY

David C. Adie

Elliott Dunlap Smith, discussing industry, says that some of the fundamental desires of the individual are self-support, including the support of one's family; self-respect, including the respect and emulation of others; self-expression; justice.

In spite of the fact that the first characteristic of modern industry is the exceedingly complicated and highly organized productive machine, it ought to be possible to permit these very elementary aspirations on the part of the individual. The industrial problem in its present form is not only relatively new but has not been subjected to a process of analysis that can be said to have produced a very great understanding of the interrelated factors. There exist abundant data on the elements of production, distribution, and other factors which enter into the material and organizational aspects of industry. When it comes to the human equation we find ourselves confused because consideration is usually carried on within a conflict area. We have not yet come to the place where we see industry apart from the fruits of labor.

We do not live only that we may provide self-support for ourselves and families, but also that we may participate in the amenities of our civilization. Industry does not and cannot exist as something apart from life. It

exists to supply human wants and to extend the area of civilization. It does not exist primarily to increase material wealth. The sooner it is recognized as only a part of the national fabric, the sooner shall we be able to relate its practices and effects to the general welfare. Furthermore, it is only when we see the relatedness of this aspect of life to that of the general life of the community that we shall be in a position to eliminate the conflict area. Expressed in the words of D. L. Hoopingarner, 'The most practical thing that industry needs to-day is an industrial philosophy that is human and, being human, is most efficient.'

Sometimes we fail to realize how rapidly the machine has developed. When these United States were organized, the industrial revolution still belonged to the future. James Watt perfected his 'improved steam engine' in 1781 at a time when industrial relations were stratified into master workmen, journeymen, and apprentices. Commerce and merchandising were similarly in an undeveloped state. Life, at however low a standard, was relatively simple. This vast, complicated, industrial, commercial, and financial organism that towers above us to-day has been developed within the time-span of our life as an organized nation. The American Revolution was culminated in an era of small shops and home manufacture. In contrast to this we find, in a volume entitled 'Modern Business' by Marshall and Wiese, the following estimate of the present-day situation: 'As time goes on, more and more of our manufacturing is done in large establishments; the figures for 1921 show that less than three per cent of our plants turned out fifty nine per cent of the total product. . . . About twenty per cent of our plants turned out ninety per cent of our total product. . . .

Clearly large-scale production is a significant feature of our industry.' It is estimated that in 1921, 250,666 plants employed 6,946,570 workers. Less than seven per cent of these plants employ slightly less than sixty-six per cent of the workers. It is also significant that in each of the plants included in this seven per cent there were more than five hundred workers employed. Involved in this, of course, is the great loss of skill on the part of the individual craftsman and his divorce from consideration and association with the complete scheme of production. Naturally in such extensive plant organization the thought, planning, and skill necessary to operation has had to be transferred from the individual to the management, involving as it must records, system, control devices, and so on. The lack of such devices would produce chaos. It is partly because of the rapidity of development and the necessity for being concerned with the mechanical and productive aspects of industry that we have witnessed the undeveloped condition that marks the consideration of the human factors. We suffer in all departments of thought from the undue influence of a production philosophy because during this rapid development we have been chiefly concerned, as a people, with the materialistic aspects of civilization. Even a casual acquaintance with the literature surrounding the early days of the development of the Taylor system of industrial efficiency must shock the reader because of the utter lack of consideration given to human rights and needs. The development of an automatic machine age has produced this condition, but it has also raised the material standards of life. It has made possible the extension of a standard of life that was beyond the concept of the leaders of former eras. Society has gained in increased wealth, variety, quantity, and

cheapness of production and the enlargement of many opportunities.

With this has come a variety of disadvantages. Individualism produced duplication and waste and the rapid rise of the industrial machine has been characterized by poor coördination and a varying degree of exploitation. The employer has been involved in extensive financial risks while the worker has been dependent on a wage system with no voice or part in the ownership and control of the industrial process. He has been compelled to live in competition with his fellows; has been limited in the opportunity for promotion; has been robbed of self-expression; suffers from periodic unemployment; has been detached from the entire process of manufacturing. In general, he has found himself involved in a social inferiority. The individual has become immersed within the industrial mechanism, whether he belongs to the employing or employed group. He bends to the influence of a machine age. It is becoming increasingly necessary that man shall either master this machine or be enslaved to it. If he will master it, and he must do this because he cannot escape it, it becomes necessary that he shall understand it in every detail. If the attempt to understand it produces only a consideration of the material factors involved, to the elimination of the human equation, he will find in reality that he is still in the position of bondage.

The social organism is plastic and nothing is as changeless as change. It is questionable whether man has ever been able effectively to secure new conditions of life by overthrowing a social system. Rather do we find that the process has been one of evolution in which disintegration from the center to the circumference was involved. For instance, the guild system involving the simple rela-

tionship of master, journeyman worker, and apprentice was not so effectively assaulted from the outside as from within. The concentration by a gradual process of a sufficient number of the guild units into the hands of more powerful individuals tended to the development of larger concerns, and the elimination of the journeyman worker from his strategic position from which ordinarily he graduated to the place of ownership. When we add to this the growing cost and complexity of machinery and the necessity of developing national and international markets and finance, we see man arriving at the time when simple relationships within industry inevitably disappear and with this condition comes the submerging of the individual. It is impossible for the ordinary student of social affairs to refrain from challenging the present condition. It is impossible in particular for those concerned with family life to assume that the family and all other social institutions must, whether it is desirable or not, adjust themselves to the demands and commands of one creature of our civilization.

It is just here that those of us concerned with the welfare of the family structure demand that reconsideration be given to the amenities of life and that the emphasis shall be placed upon life as a whole and not upon sections of living. Discussing human relations, Taylor and Brown say: 'There are two vital concepts essential to an understanding and appreciation. One is that the day-by-day life of every individual is in every way but a part of the day-by-day life of the group of which he is a member. The other is that ethics, whether called "public ethics" or not, constitute standards of conduct set by groups. Righteousness inheres in right human relationship and unrighteousness inheres in wrong human

relationship.' 'If the responsibility of participation is not accepted by the citizens, democracy loses its capacity to guarantee the integrity of wholesome, individual life. For such integrity and such wholesomeness can be assured only by the creative function which the individual performs by participation.'

It is inevitable then that the social worker viewing industry desires to see those conditions obtain which will enable those engaged in industry to seek and find their fullest expression through participation in supplying human wants and the advancement of our civilization. To view business from the point of view of profit, from the amount rather than the nature of the product, to see labor as a mere commodity, bartered about in an area of conflict, is to admit of a situation that is not to public advantage.

Efficient administration of labor relationships depends upon the clearness with which we see economic conditions and possibilities on the one hand and human factors on the other. The individual in industry may not be able clearly to define his position but surely such a definition would involve a better status in life; a greater share in the responsibility of the business enterprise itself through the development of a wider participation in the creation of the policies that surround hours, conditions of work and the individual share in the product. The individual lives, in the last analysis, in certain well-defined areas. These may be described as the areas of economics, health, education, leisure, culture, and the spiritual. To the extent to which the individual can adequately function in these areas, he is free. The management group suffers greatly under the pressure of business. Its members are not free from the wear and tear involved in this aspect of life but

they are more free in the sense that they can more readily engage their interests in forms of life and living that offset the detrimental effects of the day-by-day struggle in the industrial field. This may be brought home to us by some figures presented by the National Bureau of Economic Research. In 1913, the average earnings of the factory employee in the United States were $705. In 1918, they were $1148. If these figures are reduced to dollars of constant purchasing power based on the 1913 price level, they become $705 in 1913 and $726 in 1918.

These figures, it seems to me, make clear the fact that the majority of our people engaged in industrial pursuits must find it increasingly difficult to escape from the pressure of the economic area into other areas which would provide for self-development and release. The average worker has had neither time nor resources to do much more than secure a mere living from an impersonal environment.

It is becoming apparent that the discussion of the subject is being clouded by traditional emotion arising out of conditions no longer current factors in industry. It is also apparent that no very satisfactory discussion can follow the general blanket-like policy that has prevailed. Nor can we continue to discuss blindly, in a merely repetitious manner, aspects which have been handed around from one theorist to another. For instance, nearly every person dissatisfied with industrial relations lays enormous emphasis on the question of monotony. One cannot discuss industry purely from a production point of view, neither do I think we can determine the reaction of the individual worker to his job merely by a study of a particular factor in the industrial process. Non-industrial organizations seem to suffer from most of the ills which we deplore in

the business world. So far as I am able to observe, many teachers are bored and discontented with their condition and I have a very strong suspicion that the same thing holds true of many of our social workers, yet there are surely few positions that allow more definitely for the expression of the creative instinct than do these two types of work. Why, then, should we find that routine governs and restricts the individual in these vocations? Is it not because of the individual himself? Is it not true that discontent with one's job may very definitely involve discontent with one's self? I am not maintaining that monotony does not have a very definite effect on the individual. It would seem that fatigue is often confused with monotony and that many of the conditions we observe are due to the former rather than the latter. I question very much whether the worker is half as conscious of the so-called effects of monotony as are those who speculate on the subject. There can be no question that specialization, fatigue, and monotony dull the mental life and thereby affect the social group — which is the world in which the individual finds himself. Retardation is thus involved within the industrial process itself. In spite of this, however, we are charging against windmills when we seek to confine our consideration of this aspect of the problem only within the industrial realm. Modification of industrial processes and conditions can never eliminate the necessity of establishing contact between the individual and the communal resources which will provide the necessary avenues of compensation and release. This may involve a complete reconsideration of our recreational, cultural, and allied facilities within the community. It may even involve a complete restatement of accepted standards and values within these areas of activity.

I have no reason to believe that the position of the individual in the simple industrial organism that preceded the present form was a less drab existence. The opportunity for a varied expression of life is certainly infinitely greater to-day than it was in the eighteenth century. I think that we suffer in this respect from a tendency to romance and to traffic in golden ages. We must be realists enough to conceive that one cannot possibly expect to escape the vehicle of production. The fault lies rather in the fact that the mine, the factory, and the warehouse have been divorced in our mind from the community. They are no more separate entities than are our schools, churches, parks, roads, and theaters. It is the same worker spending eight or ten hours in the factory who comes back to the community and the family. His life is governed to as great an extent by the intimate affairs of his family and communal relationships as by his industrial condition. I am not pleading for a policy of hands-off in industry. I am simply emphasizing the fact that there are many aspects of monotony that lie outside the realm of business. Indeed, I question whether the monotony experienced by a worker at a machine is greater than that felt by the average housewife with her never-ending routine, carried forward in a drab community with definitely restricted opportunities for entertainment and pleasure. The daily round and common task in a household limited economically, crushed by a gray environment, and affected by the large element of chance, is oppressive. The wear and tear of the intimate affairs of family life are, in my opinion, more corrosive than the experiences of the man in the factory. All of us will recognize that merely going out into the world, with the opportunity to talk sports, politics, shop conditions, and manifold other questions,

far exceeds in interest the sphere which is occupied by the average housewife.

We are engaged in a great waste of energy if we attempt a solution within the industrial organism instead of viewing the possibility of individual development so that an escape can be effected into other areas of living. The experiences of Denmark and elsewhere of the beneficial effects of a comprehensive and intelligent system of adult education — well-rounded and varied in its aspects — must not be lost sight of. The dynamic influences thus brought into the life of the individual, especially during the years between eighteen and twenty-five, have enormous possibilities of enlarging and enriching the individual life. Rigid life patterns produced through repetitious industrial processes can thus be at least partially offset and the individual enabled more satisfactorily to secure his own adjustments within his environment through widening and extending interest zones.

Mr. S. A. Lewisohn has stated this very concretely: 'What the worker wants will depend on the particular situation. The one broad answer most useful in the present instance is that it is the responsibility of every production executive to study his particular situation and to create conditions that will bring about the best local adjustment. It is sometimes useful to make a purely tentative classification as a framework for discussion. If, in this spirit, I should summarize, in broad terms, certain general concepts that should guide an executive in dealing with his workers, I should roughly classify the more important desires of the workmen as, first, the desire for justice; second, the desire for status; and third, the desire to have his job made a career.'

In spite of all that can be said with reference to the

difficulties inherent in the industrial situation; in spite of all the limitations relating to the opportunity of the individual, in spite of all the materialism that governs our communities to-day, it is my contention that we are only making matters worse by our present policy of general fulmination. In some respects, poverty can be considered as a general social condition. Have we not learned that the approach is more successfully made in the individual community through the individual family than by any other method? The application of an 'ism' may be broad in its effect but it will fail in meeting the specific problems involved in a variety of situations. No one has any broad generalization as to one cause of poverty. We see the existence of a great variety of co-determining factors. Is there not some analogy between this and the industrial situation? Is the position of the individual to be enhanced by some rule-of-thumb method, or by the sympathetic study of a specific situation? While it may be a general statement, I believe it is true that the industrial conditions in a plant will reflect the social-mindedness of the executive to a greater degree than we have been willing to admit. Admitting frankly the chaotic conditions that obtain and the fact that the acquisitive habit and desire for power are producing difficulty for the individual in industry, is it not also true that the very fierceness with which some of us have spoken about injustice has had the effect of solidifying positions and class consciousness? General statements like 'the undependability of the worker' or 'the avaricious nature of the employer' are not very helpful in securing a solution of the problem. Too much time has been spent in drawing the line of battle and too little time has been given to securing a sympathetic understanding between the managerial group on the one

hand and the employed group on the other. The trial and error method that is being attempted in many of the businesses will be of great advantage. The outcome of the experiments in labor management now being carried forward in the several branches of the clothing industry, the printing industry, and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, to cite but a few, contain more hope, in my opinion, than most of the blanket schemes for reform. Industrial relations are not always governed by what appears on the surface.

I see no possibility of there being any change for the better in industrial relations unless plans are developed along lines similar to what is generally known as the 'case-work method.' Indeed, I am coming to believe that this is true with reference to all departments of life and living.

A study of the actual situation would improve much of the legislation that goes through our legislatures. It is conceivable that an educational institution should build its curriculum in a haphazard manner, but it leads to chaos when a community carries forward its government in a piecemeal fashion, and it is most certainly true that most of the problems that affect the individual in industry are due to the fact that we have created a conflict area in which no real thought is being given to the particular aspects of a localized problem. If industry is going to remain isolated from the rest of life; if it is going to be governed purely from the point of view of production; if the personnel departments are merely efficiency bureaus; and if we are not going to appreciate the criss-cross of life, with all its complicated emotionalism, we shall not accomplish very much. If, on the other hand, the business executive can think in terms of the human factor as well as the raw

materials of production; if in our large organized units of industry it can be as much a matter of pride to secure the welfare of the worker as quantity of product; if there can be brought home to all parties concerned some simple concept of the interplay of home life, community conditions, and economic status of the individual, we may rationally expect to see a development toward more stable relationships and real freedom. If we are dominated by a philosophy of merely standing guard over material gains we will inevitably intensify and enlarge the conflict. If, through patience and understanding, we can bring ourselves to a study of the human equation in industry we shall, in all probability, not only discover a few general principles which can be universally applied, but shall also learn the art of corporate living.

The present policy most certainly is not showing any hope of rediscovering the individual. It is leading to an ever-widening area of complication. It is affecting the very innermost parts of our social being. We must recognize in industry as in every other phase of life that the feelings, motives, and aspirations of one individual are pretty much the same as those experienced by another, and that the mental processes in a broad sense are fundamentally the same in most normal people. Intelligent development of personnel departments, a wider social sense on the part of executive and foreman, and a similar development on the part of the individual worker will do more to produce a satisfactory working relationship than general schemes of reform.

I hope no one will assume that this means the abandonment of organization either on the part of the employer or the worker. One cannot very easily see the life of the modern world carried on apart from mass organization.

Trade unions and employers' associations are basically meeting legitimate group needs and can be expected to play a larger rather than a smaller part in our community life. In the last analysis, however, it is the leadership of these institutions expressed through understanding men and women, motivated by a high idealism and concerned with the application of intelligence and sympathy, that will enable us to find satisfactory adjustment in our industrial relationship. Nothing possesses value apart from living beings. Industry must not only meet the economic wants but it must meet them in such a manner and under such conditions as will recognize the interplay of other social institutions and modes of association. Industry, for example, has economic and social reasons for assisting in maintaining a high character of family life in all aspects. It must sense this even to so great an extent as to cause executives and foremen to be aware of the seemingly small but nevertheless tremendous situations which characterize the day-by-day life of the individual within the family. For instance, the effect on production, satisfaction with the job, or even freedom from accident on the part of the individual worker in the shop is definitely related to sickness in the home, the delinquency of children, misunderstanding between husband and wife, and a host of other disturbing influences. Is it too much to expect that the day will arrive when these factors will be considered in the plant just as definitely as the production quota? Industry must also come to realize that understanding, sympathy, and altruism are very definite characteristics with real social significance. The misapplication of these leads to paternalism. The right application will assist in developing the conditions conducive to the best interests of all parties concerned, and

in addition, provide the worker with the opportunity, through his own direction and efforts, to secure the things which he may reasonably expect. These are not mere matters of economics, but involve a well-rounded life of economic stability, physical vigor, and the finer things of a cultural and spiritual life.

IX

NEW TOOLS OF LEISURE

KARL DE SCHWEINITZ

'FOR they . . . assign only six hours to work, three before noon, upon the which they go straight to dinner; and after dinner, when they have rested two hours, then they work three hours and upon that they go to supper.'

Sir Thomas More no longer sounds Utopian. His working day — nine in the morning to five in the afternoon — would scarcely seem startling in a modern office, and we can almost match his additional hour of rest at noon with our short Saturday and our summer holidays. Industry is completing the victory of the eight-hour standard and experiments with the five-day week indicate the direction of future progress. The same generation which has achieved the submarine of Jules Verne and which sends music over the air beyond the dreams of 'Looking Backward' is now on the way toward realizing a leisure that centuries have held to be one of the impossibilities of a visionary island.

During nearly all of the four hundred years since the publication of 'Utopia,' the world continued living under the influence of an agricultural régime in which work lasted from sunrise or earlier to sunset or later. Then in the memory of our own times came the great change. Industry displaced farming as a standardizing factor. For hundreds of thousands of people the hours of labor were reduced by fully a third, and for the first time in

history leisure became a settled part of the life of a whole nation.

It was an experience for which we were unprepared. We did not enter upon the new régime at one step. We have arrived gradually, occupation by occupation, and we are still consolidating our gains. It has been difficult for us to appreciate the implications of what has happened, the more so because there is little that the past can offer us by way of suggestion. Never before have blocks of time been isolated from the day and set apart from work for the profit of everybody.

The leisure class, to be sure, has been a familiar phenomenon, but however much its fortune has been envied its use of that fortune has seldom been regarded as worthy of emulation. Often, indeed, it has been a cause of social upheaval. How large a factor in such movements as the early Christian Church, the Reformation, Puritanism, and the French Revolution, was protest against the morals of the time, disapproval of the way in which the leisure class was spending its leisure? Its failure as a class in the use of its leisure has prevented us from profiting by the successes of its individuals.

When we entered upon our new working régime the universal conception of leisure was rest. Hitherto the hours of labor had been so long that at the end of the day the laborer was chiefly conscious of his weariness. The human race, like Mr. Pickwick's cab horse, had been borne up so very tight and taken in so very short that it had been quite ready to fall down when released from harness. We were too tired to think of anything but rest.

Rest, through all the ages, has been looked forward to as the great boon. 'There the wicked cease from troubling and there the weary are at rest.' The New Testament in

one of its most comforting passages offers rest to all that 'labor and are heavy laden,' while Milton describes the fallen angels as being in 'regions of sorrow, doleful shades where peace and rest can never dwell.' Rest, surcease from labor, release from work — that to mankind has in itself been an end. It was this that gave the Blessed Isles their classic charm.

> They till not the ground, they plow not the wave,
> They labor not, never, oh never!
> Not a tear do they shed, not a sigh do they heave,
> They are happy for ever and ever.

Philosophically this conception of leisure as rest continued down to the present generation. In practice, however, rest frequently degenerated into idling. The loafer became an evident part of the life of every community — not merely the professional loafer who never worked but the man who had nothing to do when work was done. As industry increased its concentration of population, the groups of men and boys lounging at the end of the day in front of the post office, before the livery stable and the grocery store, and on street corners became larger.

They were recognized as a problem, but not so much because of their loafing as because they were violating an essential part of our philosophy of leisure.

Leisure when defined as rest meant rest at home. Our ideal was the 'Cotter's Saturday Night'; our favorite picture, that of the workman lifting at evening the latch of the gate in the whitewashed picket fence while at the open door in the white cottage at the end of the path stand wife and children waiting to welcome him. This was the goal of leisure — rest with the family at home.

We therefore failed to appreciate the presence of another problem that, while less obtrusive than the loafing

on street corners, was just as stultifying. This was the idling at home that reached its most visible expression on the front porch.

When this adult generation was young, no house was completely furnished which, in addition to its rocking-chairs, did not have pillows and cushions for those who sat on the front steps. Here, the day's work done, the young women in their best dresses would establish themselves, waiting to receive their friends of both sexes or to sally forth upon a visit to a neighboring porch. In this they were controlled by custom rather than by the prospect of pleasure. The same people who would meet today had been together yesterday. Nothing new had happened in the interval. There were no new ideas, and conversation frequently degenerated into critical remarks about absent ones interspersed with petty teasings and gigglings.

This front porch idling reached its worst when the young people gathered on Sunday afternoon, stodgy from a dinner heavier than those during the week and cramped from the restraint of church, Sunday school, and Sunday clothes. All the varieties of walks possible to a Sunday had been exhausted and there was nothing to do but sit about together in mutual and unrelieved boredom.

As we look back to the romance of childhood and youth and the adventures we had and the good times we experienced, we recall most readily the things we did. We are less likely to recollect the hours when we did nothing, yet in them was the problem of leisure.

This problem might have become serious to the point of recognition if the machine which was increasing our leisure had not also begun to supply us with tools for enjoying it. The bicycle, the phonograph, the player piano,

the automobile, the motion picture, and later the radio, came to us just as we were reaching saturation so far as idleness was concerned. Undoubtedly they have saved leisure from becoming a menace, but in doing this they have run counter to our philosophy and so we regard them with suspicion.

As we see the Sunday procession of automobiles on the highways and as in the evenings we watch the crowds thronging the motion picture houses we repeat the familiar formula — the American people are always on the go and they are never at home. We are so disturbed at the manner in which our doctrine of leisure seems to be disregarded that we are unable to control our anxiety long enough to examine the facts. Actually, it is a question whether people are away from their families or even from their homes as much as they were in the days before our acquisition of leisure.

Of all recreation the motion picture is most frequently accused of taking us from home. There are approximately 163,000 seats in the motion picture theaters of Philadelphia.[1] Motion picture distributors estimate daily attendance at twice seating capacity. That would be for Philadelphia 326,000. The city's population of school age or older is estimated at a little less than 1,800,000.[2] This means that, on an average, each person in Philadelphia visits a motion picture house once every five-and-a-half days, a ratio in agreement with estimates of attendance throughout the United States.

From 1907 to 1924 the unionized trades reporting to the United States Bureau of Labor showed an average

[1] Official estimate.

[2] The statistical data in this paper have been compiled by William J. Deeney, Research Secretary of the Family Society of Philadelphia.

reduction in hours of 8.7 per cent. This is equivalent to an increase in leisure of more than four hours a week, enough to make possible weekly attendance at two motion picture shows of the usual two hours each without decreasing the time the wage earner formerly spent with the family. But this does not take into consideration decreases in hours achieved prior to 1907 in many industries. Moreover it is an average by occupations in which an occupation with one hundred men would have equal value with one of ten thousand.

In certain occupations leisure has increased far above this average. In 1914 there were 50,726 employees in establishments in the men's clothing industry reporting to the United States Bureau of Labor who had a working week of fifty-four hours or more. In 1923 there were only 4440 employees with a week of fifty-four hours or more. In 1914 there were 35,114 employees working forty-eight hours or less. In 1923, 172,077 were working forty-eight hours or less, of whom 142,815 were working forty-four hours or less.[1] Tens of thousands of workers in this industry have thus had ten hours or more added to their leisure. They can visit five motion picture shows a week and still be with their families as much as they were in 1914.

Milkmen in San Francisco have recently won the eight-hour day.[2] They go to work at seven o'clock in the morning and stop at three-thirty in the afternoon. Modern methods of refrigeration have made it possible for the driver of a milk wagon to do his work in the day time; thereafter to go to a motion-picture show, and still get home in time for dinner. Even more dramatic is the addi-

[1] Statistical Abstract of the United States.

[2] *Monthly Labor Review*, February, 1927.

tion to the leisure of the employees of the United States Steel Corporation.[1] Fully 70,000 of these workers can now go to two motion-picture shows a day and still have more time with their families than they had prior to 1923.

Professional baseball has been accused of taking men from home. The total attendance at the seven games of the World's Series last year was 328,051.[2] In 1919, when prohibition went into effect, there were 1800 saloons in Philadelphia.[3] If each saloon had had a daily average of only twenty-six men who stayed for a succession of drinks, the combined saloon population for seven days would have exceeded the largest World's Series attendance in the history of baseball.

As a pleasure vehicle the automobile is distinctly a week-end and pleasant evening machine. It is a family conveyance, parents and children using it together. Instead of sitting on the front steps, with 'Goswell Street at their feet, Goswell Street on the right hand, and Goswell Street on the left,' they sit in an automobile and see country that was as unexplored Africa to them a few years ago.

Leisure has increased beyond the time needed for the tools that must be used away from the house, and many of the new tools are only substituting for old ones that have been discarded. In addition there are attractions to keep us at home that did not exist when we were born. There has yet to be published the biography of a successful man in the last generation which does not tell how his books were limited to a scant half-dozen. In 1926, the

[1] Gulick: *Labor Policy of the United States Steel Corporation.*

[2] *World Almanac*, 1927.

[3] Clerk of the Court of Quarter Sessions, Philadelphia County.

Philadelphia Public Library circulated 4,099,977 books,[1] the New York Library 9,411,167 books,[2] while in 1923 the number of published books and pamphlets circulated in the United States was 359,391,016.[3] In 1884 there were 2988 libraries with one thousand volumes or more in the United States. In 1923 there were 8544.[4] Reading is largely a home occupation.

The care of the home one owns is an absorbing interest and pleasure for the householder and tends to keep him within the bounds of his own property. In 1920, 10,-866,960 families in the United States owned their own homes [5] and this was before the recent wave of home ownership had reached its peak.

The player piano and the phonograph have been factors in adding to the pleasures of home. Recently they have in interest, if not in number, been eclipsed by radio. It is estimated that there are six million radio sets in the United States [6] and the number is growing daily.

There should be added to these considerations the increase that has taken place in the leisure of children and young people. The National Child Labor Committee started in 1902. Before that in many states there was no legal age at which children were too young to work. In 1890 there were approximately 200,000 pupils in the high schools of the United States. There are now nearly 4,000,000.[7] The various vacation periods give these

[1] Official figures, Philadelphia Free Library.

[2] Official figures, Public Library, City of New York.

[3] U.S. Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce.

[4] U.S. Bureau of Education.

[5] U.S. Bureau of Census.

[6] Willis Kingsley Wing, Editor, *Radio Broadcast.*

[7] *Journal of Education*, July 4, 1927; 'Shift Emphasis in Education,' by Paul C. Stetson, Superintendent of Schools, Dayton, Ohio.

students vastly more leisure than did the strict routine of industry.

Women in industry have profited in recreational opportunity along with men. Women at home have gained more time for themselves through the use of inventions and the help of manufactured products. The housewife may be out and about more than formerly, but shall we say that she and her family are not better off than when baking and canning and manual labor made the home chiefly a workshop rather than a tool of leisure to be enjoyed with husband and children? In the good old days the man came home to rest. This was his masculine privilege. His wife might meet him at the door to add to the joy of his home-coming, but straightway she returned to her labor and there was little opportunity for them to recreate together. To-day the burden of proof rests upon those who feel that the new tools of leisure are reducing the hours that the members of families spend with each other. Has not the time come for an inquiry into the whole theory of rest at home as the goal of leisure and for study to determine in the light of new experience what leisure really involves?

Any such inquiry would immediately reveal that many of the highest joys of leisure are solitary. One must preferably be alone to meditate. One must usually be alone to create, certainly in writing and in musical composition and quite frequently in drawing and painting. Reading that tends towards study needs to be free from interruption. To walk solitarily, to be alone in an observatory with a telescope, to browse among old volumes in a library is to violate both the principle of rest and that of association with one's family, and yet who will deny the delight to be had in these ways.

It is quality of association much more than quantity that produces the greatest returns in happiness at home. The most precious memories we have of our parents are those often of comparatively brief periods of fellowship. We may derive our sense of security with our mother's milk and from the tender daily care she gives us during infancy and childhood, but an hour of tennis will create more satisfaction in adolescence than a day of meaningless being together. Granted that hours of contact with paternal example, unconsciously though nevertheless closely observed, may influence a whole career, yet they will be dim compared with the shining ten minutes when one's father first read aloud:

> The Assyrian came down like the wolf on the fold,
> And his cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold,
> And the sheen of their spears was like stars on the sea,
> When the blue wave rolls nightly on deep Galilee.

It is what each member contributes to the family that makes the life of the home. The family cannot exist of and by itself. It is dependent upon experience and the closest interplay between itself and the world outside. The family that huddles together on the front steps is safe, but how stultifying is its leisure. Only as parents and children go forth adventuring — and there is fully as much adventure in an hour with a microscope as in an hour at the north pole — can they bring back to each other the variety and the interest that makes of comradeship a recreation.

This does not preclude doing things together away from home. Home is where the family is, not necessarily where the house is. Home can be in the drawing room of a Pullman, in an automobile or in a tent in the woods. People, not materials, make the home.

Grant these four principles — that many of our highest joys are solitary, that quality of association is more potent than quantity, that the family is as dependent upon the experience of its members as living creatures are upon food, and that home is where the family is — grant these four things and the bogy of rest at home will yield to a new and more dynamic conception of leisure.

Leisure is the time we have to do what we want to do. It will include rest. It may include rest at home. To-day we are making large use of it in exercising our faculties of appreciation. We are continually being invited to do this by the new tools of leisure, both those which have come to us as the product of the machine and those which are the result of commercial and civic activity. We listen to the phonograph, the player piano, the radio. We see the motion picture, the baseball game, the football game, the tennis match. We visit art galleries and attend symphony concerts and the theater. In all this many people find great occasion for concern. They feel that we are passive, that we are entertained instead of entertaining, that we are degenerating because we watch sports when we ought to be engaging in them ourselves.

Such people are right in fearing overemphasis of passive entertainment, but the remedy is not in a reduction of opportunities now offered but in the improvement of them and in the finding of other tools of leisure. There is also need for recognition of the value of the appreciative faculties and the manner in which they tend to seek ever finer mediums. The development of music in the United States is encouraging testimony to this fact, not merely in the quality of our symphony orchestras, but in the better character of the music to be heard in the motion picture theaters and through the radio. Nor is there occasion

to feel discouragement at the interest in watching sports. It has yet to be proved, in the face of rapidly increasing municipal and private provision for recreation, that individual participation is decreasing. Moreover, sport as a spectacle is not by any means a stupid watching of other people work. There is a close kinship between the fan and the art connoisseur. The same fundamental appreciation of beauty is present in both. The dispatch with which the baseball player handles the ball, the swing of the bat, the arc of the flight, the tennis player's timing of stroke and step, all reveal a rhythm and a grace that the artist can only attempt to copy, while in the analysis of strategy the spectator finds a keen and exhilarating mental exercise.

The motion picture has yet to achieve the beauty that music and sport can offer. In truth, in dramatic unity, in composition, it has not matched the quality of its photography. It would almost seem as if the appreciative faculties that deal with music, with line, and with rhythm are capable of a speedier and more general education than those which have to do with structure and with the beauties of artistic conception. In these latter aspects, is it not possible that the motion picture has a much closer and more fundamental relation to literature than we have hitherto realized? There is need for some one to recognize in it the same opportunity for popular education that Walter Damrosch has perceived in radio. Why should not the theater guild and the little theater idea be applied here? The motion picture to-day is the most generally available tool for the exercise of the appreciative faculties. If not the adults, at least the children who throng to it only to be debauched by excitement should have the best that art can offer. Those who feel a concern for the

quality of our use of leisure would do well to turn their attention in this direction.

Despite all the emphasis upon commercial entertainment it is by no means certain that, as many people fear, we are losing interest in creative effort. It is a question whether appreciation of another's skill does not arouse the desire for emulation. Hundreds of thousands of people attend athletic contests but is it not because of this interest that it has been possible for municipalities to develop public golf courses, tennis courts, swimming-pools, and recreation centers? Certainly, the average player, to whom sport is an activity of leisure, is more skillful and more graceful in performance to-day than he was a few years ago.

When the boys of this generation learned to swim they were for the most part satisfied if they could propel themselves into and through the water. They used the swimming-hole, often despite parental disapproval and usually without parental interest or support. To-day both boys and girls are encouraged to go to the swimming-pool and they are no longer content with the crudities that passed with us. Efficiency in stroke and form in diving are cultivated, and there has been a great achievement in beauty and in skill.

The same development has taken place in tennis. Courts no longer have a ground hazard and the players are not satisfied merely with the capture of a match. They care about the quality of the strokes with which they win, and here, too, as also in golf, the girl has left the idleness of the front porch for the practice of an athletic art.

We have yet to realize the opportunity that dancing offers for the expression of beauty and grace. We have thought of dancing too much in terms of the relation be-

tween the sexes. Our civic efforts have been to regulate and supervise, to see that dancing is proper. We have been concerned too little with the art of the dance and such interest as we have felt has been segregated among the comparatively few persons who are prepared to practice the rhythmic and the interpretative dance and the slightly larger number who have engaged in folk dancing.

There should be emphasis upon skill and beauty in those forms of dancing — namely, the fox trot and the waltz and their various derivatives — in which the majority of people who dance participate. Little is being done to cultivate art here. Most of the dancing classes which are organized for children as a form of social equipment do not teach much more than the steps. Once these are acquired the class is merely a vehicle for bringing the young people together.

The same spirit and attitude that characterizes our approach to sport should be applied to developing form in the common varieties of the dance. They should be included as part of the athletic curriculum of the school. They should have their place along with the drills and marches in gymnastic exhibitions. Let art be emphasized and not only will these dances be executed more beautifully but there will develop out of them interest in the rhythms which afford greater opportunity for the expression of grace and skill.

Of the three arts, conventionally and most generally recognized as creative — writing, drawing, and music — writing is least often exploited as an activity of leisure. For the most part, people either write as a career or they do not write at all, and when they write as a career, whether vocationally or avocationally, they do so as a means of professional or economic advancement. Writ-

ing becomes a chore, even though frequently a pleasant one.

Writing to-day is the result of a process of selection, for only the most hardy and self-convinced authors can survive an educational system which too often chokes the interest of its children with grammatical definition and literary exercise. Unfortunately, those who live through this experience almost inevitably become infected with the ideals of an environment which, whatever it may intend, has the ultimate effect of implying that training in the art of writing means preparation *to write*. Thus many people with ability enough to give pleasure to themselves and possibly even to their friends are graduated with the belief that they must make writing their career, and what might have been a source of happiness during leisure becomes a thwarting influence in the finding of a vocation.

If the art of letter-writing seems to have been abandoned it is because those who might practice it either have never been educated to its delights or are spending all their time in professional effort. If place cards are bought and not made at home, and if the charming custom of writing verse on family anniversaries and like occasions is seldom met with, it is largely because children soon learn that poetry is one of the things one has to do for school, as such being subject to rule and regulation, and that the composing of verse at any other time is an admission of one's desire to take place beside Shakespeare and the other immortals.

Many interesting though isolated attempts are being made to encourage early efforts at self-expression through writing, but the real hope for this aspect of leisure lies in the willingness of the schools to emancipate writing from grammatical formulism on the one hand and from literary

implication on the other, so that it may develop naturally and spontaneously as a tool to be modified by each individual in accordance with his personality and his needs.

However ideal the conditions under which writing may be taught, it is not likely ever to have so general an appeal as music and the graphic arts. The movement to encourage the development of creative skill in both these fields has made great headway and in this the settlement and the school have played an important part. The revival of the woodcut, and the increase of interest in etching are by no means limited to the professional artist and the number of amateurs now painting pictures is large. Why should there not then be a general return to mural decoration wherein as an activity of leisure some appropriately gifted member of the family would use the walls of the home as his canvas; and why should we not make our own Christmas cards?

As in writing, so in music and the graphic arts, the greatest hindrance to the development of recreational tools is the tendency toward professionalism. Let an individual exhibit a moderate skill and he desires instantly to commercialize it. The young woman who sings must enter the operatic field. The boy who sketches must become an illustrator. As an antidote there should be constant repetition of the art-for-art's-sake motif.

The schools of correspondence and the extension departments of universities have tended to foster the commercialization of culture not only in art but in all departments of knowledge. There is too much evaluation of education in terms of the ten-thousand-dollar job. The night school beckons the student with the promise of making an executive out of a clerk. It says little about learning for the sake of finding out, yet there is abundant

testimony to the large number of people who pursue discovery for its own sake.

There are seventeen thousand amateur radio broadcasters in the United States, and, it is estimated, three hundred thousand non-professional persons who have a practical knowledge of radio.[1]

Does not their work contain the suggestion for a most satisfying use of leisure, namely activity in the sciences? The schools and universities should invite to their laboratories those who would like to learn more of the world about them. Why should not the telescope, the microscope, and the test tube be made available to those whose interest in science is not colored by utilitarian visions of additional income or a Ph.D. degree, and why should not chemistry, biology, astronomy, physics, be made as attractive for amateur experiment as radio has been? There is nothing so tragic in the life of our secondary schools as the way in which the interest inherent in such studies as geography and physiology is choked by the cataloguing of cities and the memorizing of bones; and how barren of all inspiration is that extension of pedagogic despotism so appropriately named home work.

The school, along with such organizations as the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts, has made a great contribution to leisure by fostering the study of the wild life of the woods and fields. To-day there are thousands of city children who know vastly more about birds and flowers than did the country children of a generation ago. The growth of municipal, state, and federal park systems has given great opportunity for this type of recreation. The example of cities like New York and Chicago, which have acquired park lands outside of city territory where people

[1] Willis Kingsley Wing, Editor, *Radio Broadcast.*

can camp and live a back-to-nature life should be more generally followed so that every large community might have within twenty or thirty miles of its boundaries a wide acreage devoted to wood and stream and wild life for the use and appreciation of its citizens.

Trails such as the Green Mountain Club and the Appalachian Mountain Club have developed in Vermont and New Hampshire should be laid in every State in the Union, a task that might appropriately be assigned to the departments of forestry. The automobile has made the highway unpleasant to the hiker and part of the revenue from motor cars might appropriately be used in the making of byways for the walker, byways with shelters at convenient intervals where the traveler may camp for the night. Walking will lure men so long as it contains the possibility of adventure with nature. The open road has been taken from them. Let them have the path through the woods.

We need opportunity not only to discover but also to reflect. Our catalogue of facts is steadily increasing. Our store of food for thought grows greater every day. We need to assimilate and absorb. We need to wonder and to worship, yet in these bustling times we know little of the art of meditation. This is peculiarly the province and opportunity of the Church. There should be experimentation with the kinds of service that may best foster reflection. There should be deliberate effort to cultivate the art of meditation as, for example, has been done by the Society of Friends and in certain of the retreats of the Roman Catholic Church.

The home also has its responsibility. Wherever possible the household should be organized in such a way that at times some room may be available for thought. Those

families which are able to reserve a room for guests might in the intervals between hospitality use it as a place for reflection.

This use of a guest-room is more possible than it would have been a generation ago, for our friends do not visit us as much as they did. The art of fellowship has not been aided by the development of the machine. It would seem almost as if the very means of communication that we thought would bring us together have tended to isolate us from each other. The days when the man walked to work talking pleasantly with his friends and when the woman knew her neighbors are passing. Now the man does not speak to his seat-mate on train or electric car and feels hurt if he is interrupted in the reading of his paper. Often he commutes to work alone in his motor car. No longer do we choose our friends from among our neighbors. We pick them here and there over an area of twenty miles. There is a corresponding loss in the friendliness that goes with informality. Even the children must see each other by appointment. To visit our friends is more of an effort than it used to be when we lived next door, and so often we use the telephone instead.

A generation ago the family was always ready at a moment to entertain unexpected visitors and there was always an ample store of jellies and provisions against such a contingency. Now friends would not think of inviting themselves for dinner. Herein we are losing one of the richest joys of leisure. We need a revival of the art of hospitality and, most specifically, of the art of informal dining. It is an art which the distance separating us from each other makes desirable and which the revolution in our eating habits makes especially interesting. There is a daintiness about the modern table that

is as vastly more attractive than the heavily laden and bounteous courses of the past as the thin, delicious sandwich of to-day is superior to its thick substantial forerunner of a generation ago. Skill can reduce the expense of hospitality and variety of experience can make its conversation more interesting.

Entertainment should as often and as much as possible be a family affair. The children should be included. There is no experience in the home so exciting or so interesting to a child as the across-the-table talk of guests and hosts. It opens many doors to the world outside and it reveals his parents in a new light as he sees them through the eyes of their peers — and if he feels that he too can have his place in the conversation and be a participant, not merely an observer, he finds a new thrill of kinship with the family that he had not sensed before.

Conversation at table should always be one of the delights of leisure, the more delightful because along with the art of cooking and serving food, it takes time devoted to the necessity of eating and makes of it a pleasure. Dinner is the great meeting place of the family, affording opportunity for each member to set forth the observations, the experiences, and the jokes of the day — most especially the jokes — for joking and laughter bring the generations together as few other things can.

That, too, is one of the values in the playing of games. Aside from their inherent fun they furnish a common ground for parents and children. We are all of an age when we face each other in doubles at ping-pong with one bat to a side — while, despite the manner in which bridge is often abused, it provides nevertheless one of the most satisfactory occasions for the meeting of the two generations. Exceptionally fortunate, also, is he who can

join in hop-scotch, in kicking football, or catching baseball — now played alike by boys and girls — for he has the double advantage of a good time for himself and a comradeship with his children.

Collecting is another game to which all can contribute and where all are brought closer together. It may be butterflies, it may be stamps, it may be tinfoil, it may be books, but whatever it is the family will be drawn in as to a vortex, even as the grandmother of three score and ten who suddenly found herself holding up traffic when in a moment of absorbed triumph she stooped while crossing the busy avenue to pick up the prize cigar band for her grandson's collection.

The perfection of comradeship can never be achieved between the generations. The difference in age, in experience, and in the times cannot be bridged, and whoever builds his life upon too close a fellowship of this type must either be disappointed or create a relationship that is artificial and pregnant with unhappiness.

The fellowship that offers most in understanding and in appreciation is that between the parents themselves. As the hours of leisure have increased, the time that husband and wife may and do spend with each other has also increased. Equal opportunity for education through the school has helped them toward a common intellectual footing and the new tools of leisure that commerce has supplied are essentially mutual in their appeal and use. Contrast the separation from the family which the saloon fostered with the companionship that is had in attendance at the motion picture show or in the automobile. In the absence of appropriate facts it is impossible to analyze the significance of the decrease in commercialized vice referred to for instance, in 'Does Prohibition

Work?'[1] but it is difficult to believe that the presence of the ancient evil has not through all time helped to besmirch the whole sex relationship and to surround the physical union in marriage with a furtive and dubious atmosphere.

We are fast emancipating ourselves from the tyranny of the obscene. That which each individual hid within himself as his shame is now being recognized as a common heritage, rich with possibilities of happiness. Man is no longer sole custodian of the mysteries. The prerogative of sophistication has been wrested from him. Woman demands the right to share with him the whole range of life. A mutuality of interest has developed which has given new content and a wider area of fellowship to marriage.

But the emotional life is greater than any of the sources from which it springs and the whole edifice of marriage cannot be built upon a single foundation. There is no aspect of love which is a panacea. There is no one key to the art of living. The fellowship between man and wife is the ripening of interest and shared experience quickened both by the hour of noon and by the mellowing sun of appreciation and understanding.

Inspiring and satisfying though such a fellowship may be, especially when accompanied by the comradeship of parents and children, the fullest use of leisure will include a wider kinship. The life of the family, being dependent for its complete expression upon a free interplay with the world outside, has a vast stake in the common good. Activity toward the advancement of the universal welfare

[1] Does Prohibition Work? A study of the operation of the Eighteenth Amendment made by the National Federation of Settlements; Martha Bensley Bruère, Director of the Study.

should form part of the leisure of everybody. If this is a social responsibility that to some may seem far removed from anything that savors of recreation it is nevertheless full of opportunity for the exercise of the very skills and explorations that are a goal of leisure. Nowhere else is there such scope for the practice of the art of human association or for the sort of discovery that gives one fuller appreciation of human character and life. Social service is a duty that can be sublimated into one of the great happinesses of leisure.

Even work can assume the quality of freedom that characterizes recreation. For a large number of people work is the thing that above all else they want to do. Usually the joys that accompany creative art and exploration are associated with the professions. This is because we have been slow to appreciate the beauty of the machine and the appeal it has for those who instead of being driven by it direct and control its operation. There is a fascination not merely in the significant and ordered array of polished mechanism but also in the precision with which huge masses of metal can be fitted in moving adjustment to the inconceivably infinitesimal fraction of an inch. The machine with its many wonders holds the promise of satisfaction for multitudes of workers. Having assembled and emphasized the isolated monotony that exists only too often in manual labor, it will ultimately by its own increase reduce the number of its slaves and in their stead put masters. Already the long lines of manual operators in scores of telephone exchanges have been released and replaced by those marvelous columns of rods and coils and magnets that work for us with an almost infallible accuracy. This is the way of progress. In the same direction there should be wider op-

portunity for the worker to have a voice in the control of his environment so that a new sense of freedom may come to him, and his employment may offer him many of the pleasures of his recreations.

The quality and character of our work should always determine the quality and character of our activities during leisure. It is in the well-balanced ration that for most people the greatest returns will lie. The more monotonous the work the more variety and adventure should be found in leisure. The life that is filled with discovery and the exercise of the creative faculties may well seek more opportunity for appreciation and passive enjoyment. A change of work may involve a change in the use of leisure. Witness the newly appointed stenographer of a social case working agency: 'My job's so interesting I don't have to go to the movies now.' The greatest happiness will be found where recreation supplements work.

Leisure cannot be isolated from the rest of life. It is all one. Leisure only dramatizes, only throws into relief the age-old question that asks the meaning and the purpose of existence. Leisure is the time that we have to do what we want to do. In being the first to experience it, this fortunate generation is but having a foretaste of a future when, through the reduction and the sublimation of work, man, in every hour of every day, may be doing, if he will, that which he desires.

The tools of leisure are many and various. There is little indeed in the range of human interest that, if we but capitalize the knowledge and facilities we now have, cannot be helped to find expression. The implements await the hand that can take them — the integrated and adjusted human personality which is the goal of social

case work. They even hold within themselves those satisfactions and securities which can make their possessor the master of his tools.

These tools are in many places, they can be everywhere. In cathedral or meeting house, on the athletic field, in the laboratory, in the home, in the school, on the open road they await us. They are ours to unlock the gates of life. They offer us beauty in line and in color, in the perfection of mechanism, in the rhythm of poet, dancer, athlete, musician, in the swing of trees in the wind, in all the harmonies of nature. They invite our skill in sport and in the formal arts. They entertain us with the sight and hearing of new things, a world brought to our eyes and ears by the genius of the machine. What a world also do they give us to see for ourselves, the world of travel and the world of the laboratory, the universe of microscope and telescope, infinitely small and infinitely great, receding ever and beckoning us to further wonders. Here is material for meditation and worship and here also is the call to join in coöperative effort for the common good, to reduce danger and unhappiness, to make gardens of waste places. In everything is the spirit of human fellowship for those who will make it theirs, a kinship that is as far flung as humanity but which centers in the family. Under its influence the home becomes a free relationship, a place to which each member brings the riches of his experience and where each finds both security and adventure in comradeship and in love.

Surely the unborn spirit must eagerly await a life that offers so much to appreciate, to create, to discover, so much in communion with one's fellows, so much to wonder at and to try to understand.

The number of those who achieve and who may achieve

these things is growing. Leisure increases. Work recedes, and as it recedes begins in itself to offer new possibilities. We are now so close to the dreams of the ancients that they are turning to life and for our own dreams we must look to the future. There we catch the vision of Utopias compared with which the Utopias of the past are but the letters of an alphabet, an alphabet from which our children's children will frame the realities of their golden age.

PART IV
OUTWARD AND INWARD MINISTRIES

X

THE FAMILY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOOD

FREDERICK MAY ELIOT

IN Rose Macaulay's novel, 'Dangerous Ages,' there is a striking passage describing the effort of a modern young woman to express her dissatisfaction with her own life: 'Human adventures, intellectual adventures, success, even a little fame, men and women, jokes, laughter and love, dancing and a little drink, and the fields and mountains and seas beyond — what more did one want? Roots! That was the metaphor that had eluded Nan. To be rooted and grounded in life, like a tree.'

The metaphor is, of course, a very old one — 'He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season; whose leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper' — but Nan Hilary had discovered it anew; and in that discovery I think she is a fair representative of our generation. However long ago it may have first been made, the comparison of a happy human life to a growing tree can scarcely ever have been so plainly true, or so valuable in its practical suggestiveness, as it is to-day.

For we are living in an age that has thus far had very little patience with the slow processes of Nature, without which roots cannot grow. Roots require more time than we are willing to spare. They must be let alone, and we have little disposition to let anything alone. Even when they have grown strong and struck deep, they remain out of sight; and that makes no appeal to a world that is

fretfully inquisitive. Ours is an impatient age, and roots are given little chance.

But we are beginning to see the price which we must pay for our impatience. By bitter experience we are learning that a life without roots is a life that cannot withstand storms or bear fruit in its season. Nan Hilary is quite right. Until we become 'rooted and grounded in life, like a tree,' we shall remain dissatisfied at heart. The modern world, in spite of its passion for speed and its contempt for anything it hasn't made, is commencing to realize that there are some things that cannot be done quickly and some values that cannot be artificially manufactured.

If this is true with regard to individual lives, it is not less true with regard to families; and families have suffered even more than individuals from the tendency of modern civilization to create conditions which make it impossible for roots to grow. The family has been uprooted, and the results are clearly seen by any one who takes the trouble to observe the disintegration and ineffectiveness of so much of our contemporary family life. The problem which these facts present is to replant the family in soil that is favorable to the growth of roots — and then, just as far as we can, to leave it alone for a long enough time.

The soil in which families have in the past grown best is 'those little communities which we express by the word neighborhoods,' so tenderly characterized by Steele in the 'Spectator.' But that soil is no longer available. Our modern civilization has been doing all sorts of things to the neighborhood, until it almost seems as though it had completely disappeared. The problem, therefore, is to find new soil which shall be as favorable as the old — or,

if possible, more favorable — in which the family life of our time can grow.

The purpose of this paper is to consider some of the ways in which the neighborhood has been changing, and to discuss the possibility of so utilizing what has taken its place as to make it the kind of soil in which vigorous, happy families may be planted.

I

There isn't the slightest doubt that neighborhoods are 'not what they used to be'; but when we attempt to describe in detail the changes that have come about during, say, the last fifty years, we are faced by a bewildering array of facts that do not easily submit to orderly classification and interpretation. There are, first of all, the physical changes. We think of the invasion of apartment houses and the corresponding decrease — at least relatively — of single dwellings. We are reminded by the campaigns of advertising in the street-cars, with their horrible disregard of the amenities of spelling, that the 'Naborhood Store' is suffering because of the rapid growth of chain stores and mail-order houses. New methods of cheap transportation, supplemented by prosperity that can ignore the matter of cost, have largely done away with the necessity of locating one's home within walking distance of one's work or of seeking one's amusements in the immediate vicinity of one's dwelling-place. Geographically considered, the neighborhood is rapidly ceasing to be anything more than a more or less accidental grouping of sleeping quarters.

Psychologically, the changes are even greater. In his 'Confessions of a Reformer,' Mr. Frederic C. Howe describes the way in which family life was affected by its

neighborhood in Meadville, Pennsylvania, just about fifty years ago. He tells us that 'what the neighbors might think seriously conditioned our lives. Watchful eyes observed us in all we did. There was a sense of being clamped down, stiff in a mould made for one. My mother was a neighborly person, ministering to the needs of every one on our street; but she was sensitive to their opinions and prejudices, deeply unwilling to have them flouted.' The moral standards of the neighborhood constituted a rigid fence about the lives of every individual and every family, shutting down relentlessly whenever any one wanted to break loose. Even Mr. Howe's father, who had more of the adventurous spirit, was careful to indulge his love for freedom in such a way as to escape if possible the prying eyes of the neighbors. When Booth or Joe Jefferson or Modjeska came to the local theater, the two male members of the family would sneak away to seats in the inconspicuous top gallery, with a sheepish air that betrayed how much his father cared for the opinion of his neighbors. A few 'purple spots of freedom' there were; but life in general was strictly governed by the neighborhood standards, which were inspired largely by the evangelical religion which Mr. Howe calls 'the most characteristic influence of my generation' — an influence from which he frankly admits that his mind was never emancipated.

Whether, on the whole, such influence upon an individual or a family was a good or a bad thing is not easy to say. The repressive character of strict neighborhood standards must be offset by the reënforcement which they afford to weak and wavering souls. If some families were held down by the opinions of such a neighborhood, other families were assuredly held up. If a few gifted

individuals were smothered, undoubtedly a much greater number of less fortunately endowed were sheltered and saved. The balance is an impossible one to draw with any confidence; but the important fact is that the influence was there, in very definite and tangible form, for better or worse. Fifty years ago, the neighborhood was a factor in the life of every family at a thousand different points, moulding family standards and dictating family behavior with inexorable and almost unquestioned power.

But the relation between the family and the neighborhood was one of mutual influence. If the family life was in many respects conditioned by the neighborhood, it was also true that the family had an important part in creating and changing the neighborhood. Mr. Howe mentions almost casually the fact that his mother ministered to the needs of 'every one on our street,' but that fact deserves more than a casual reference. To be a 'good neighbor' was no slight matter, and a family might become a very great factor in setting the tone of a neighborhood. The sense of responsibility which came with the consciousness of belonging to a neighborhood was a real factor in many families. It gave meaning and value to the family life, it built up the family self-respect, it nourished the roots of the family tree. The old farmer in Robert Frost's well-known poem is a fair example: 'Good fences make good neighbors.' Yes, and that kind of responsibility made good families. To the extent that the neighborhood afforded a field for the expression of family life in terms of civic responsibility and human friendliness, it was of vital importance to the family as a social entity. We cannot, I think, easily exaggerate the value to a family of feeling that it had a place and a duty because it was part of a neighborhood.

When we turn to the situation to-day, the contrast is immediately obvious. Perhaps the best way to picture it would be to call in the services of a humorist, for it sometimes happens that the humorists, like the poets, see things on the whole more clearly and set them forth with greater skill than the most erudite sociologists. In a recent number of 'Harper's Magazine,' Mr. Stephen Leacock calls attention to the fact that many of the poems on which the older generations were brought up are no longer intelligible to 'the wiser youngsters of to-day,' and he suggests that these poems should be re-written so as to make them usable in modern nurseries. With characteristic modesty, he merely offers a few samples of how it might be done; but these samples are extraordinarily suggestive as well as amusing. They reveal the learned professor of political science underneath the humorist.

For instance, Thomas Hood's familiar poem which begins

> 'I remember, I remember,
> The house where I was born'

would be changed so as to commence with these lines:

> 'I wish I could remember
> The house where I was born'

— which subtly but unmistakably suggests the vagrant and nomadic character of much of our modern family life. The changes within the family, especially in the attitude of children toward their parents, are beautifully summed up in his proposed version of the touching old verse:

> 'Father, dear father, come home with me now,
> The clock in the steeple strikes one:
> You promised, dear father, that you would come home
> As soon as your day's work was done'

— which, under Mr. Leacock's magic touch, is transformed to read:

> 'Oh, father, dear father, why won't you go out?
> Why sit here and spoil all the fun?
> We took it for granted you'd beat it downtown
> As soon as your dinner was done.'

But it is the third of his suggestions that is most closely related to our present subject. Mr. Leacock offers a revised version of 'The Village Blacksmith,' in which both the content and the form of the poem are brought down to date:

'On the corner of the main street stands the principal garage.
The garage man is a man of singular muscular development.
Children coming home from school like to watch him punch the gasoline.
On Sunday he goes to the church whenever any of the cars of the congregation break down.
In this way he not only earns a night's repose, but even now and then he can take a trip to
New York and go without repose for a whole night.'

In those five lines, I submit that Mr. Leacock has given a remarkably vivid picture of the modern neighborhood, and one that is startlingly different from Mr. Howe's picture of Meadville a half-century ago. A few things, of course, are still the same. Children apparently still go to school, even as they did in the Cambridge of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow; and they still like to loiter on the way home from school to watch a man at work, though punching gasoline is a distinctly less poetical occupation than hammering out a horseshoe. Apparently also there are still churches, and some of the owners of motor cars still go to church on Sundays. Nothing is said about the garage man's daughter, or the village choir, but perhaps we may assume that both are in existence. It would,

however, scarcely be safe to assume that the garage man, like the blacksmith, has paid all his bills, especially in view of that line about an occasional trip to New York. No; in spite of a certain number of similarities, the total effect is that of complete transformation. Gone is the spreading chestnut tree; gone, too, the lilting rhymes and rhythms of the old New England poet; and the good old neighborhood has gone with them.

Consider how, in the larger towns and cities at any rate, the neighborhood institutions have been supplanted, chiefly because of the improved methods of transportation. The church will serve as an illustration of what is going on in a great many other directions. The whole tendency to-day is away from the parish church, serving a particular locality, to what may perhaps be called the specialized church, serving a particular kind of person regardless of where he may live. The individual is free to go to whatever church happens to appeal to him, whether because he finds himself in agreement with its doctrine, or because it is about as big or as small as he likes his church to be, or because he has taken a fancy to the preacher, or for any one of a dozen other reasons. Even the denominations that are organized on the parochial basis are to-day finding it much more difficult to maintain parish lines. This is not the place to discuss the effect which this tendency is having upon the churches, but the effect upon neighborhood life and upon family life is sufficiently obvious. The neighborhood church used to be one of the most effective instrumentalities for building up the kind of neighborhood sentiment that in turn built up family life. Present-day church-going is largely unrelated to neighborhood or even family considerations. I know cases where the father of a family goes to one church, the

mother to another, and the children are enrolled in the Sunday school of a third. Perhaps each individual is better served than if all went to the same church, but the situation is very different from what it used to be when the blacksmith sat in the same pew with his boys and his daughter sang in the choir. The church as a part of the neighborhood is fast disappearing, and thus one of the chief factors in neighborhood influence upon the family is also passing.

The development of specialized schools is another tendency that works against the neighborhood. We now have separate high schools of various kinds, frequently located in various parts of the city. There are, too, a variety of special schools for children with handicaps of different sorts, including the handicap of being unduly intelligent. I am not greatly exaggerating the actual facts when I say that in a family of four or five children it is easily possible that each child will go to a different school — John to the regular high school, Mary to the so-called Mechanic Arts High School, where she can get special work in domestic science, Henry to a junior high school, Nellie to the school where special attention is given to speech defects, and Tom to the alpha class in still another school. Mind you, I don't suggest that there is anything wrong about all this; but the neighborhood school is disappearing somewhere along the line, and carrying away with it another important part of the neighborhood itself.

There is no need for me to carry further this analysis of the ways in which the good old neighborhood of yesterday is gradually being disintegrated. That the process is going on, and that it must have serious consequences for family life, seem to me obvious facts which no amount of regret or complaint can mitigate. Nor is there the slightest

chance in the world of restoring the conditions which have gone. To bring back the old neighborhood of fifty or even twenty years ago is as far outside the bounds of practical possibilities as the altogether charming dream of Mr. Ralph Adams Cram for a return to the walled towns of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

But if the neighborhood as it used to be is no longer possible, there are forces at work in our day which can be utilized to create a new kind of neighborhood that may prove to be more effective than the old in its constructive influence upon the family. There are signs that this new kind of neighborhood is emerging out of the welter of our modern civilization, and I want to turn now to a consideration of its character and possibilities.

II

If I were asked to put into a single sentence the chief difference between the old neighborhood and the new, I should say that it lies in the element of deliberate and intelligent choice which, in the new neighborhood, takes the place of accident and chance in the neighborhood of earlier days. The distinction is not, of course, absolutely clean-cut, for there has always been some measure of choice in the determination of one's neighborhood, and even to-day there is a considerable amount of sheer accident in the matter; but in the main I think the distinction is a valid and significant one. And it is one which gives us good reason to be hopeful for the future.

You will remember the cynical and hackneyed saying: 'God gives us our relatives, but thank God we can choose our friends.' Well, the most important thing about the new kind of neighborhood is that to an increasing extent we can, and do, choose our own neighbors; and that, too,

seems to be something for which we may well be grateful. For the opportunity to choose our neighbors opens the possibility of choosing them intelligently; and even if at present we fail to use very much intelligence, there is room for hope that with practice we may learn how to make our choices with more and more sense. Unless one is prepared to be cynical in a radical and thoroughgoing fashion, whatever enlarges the scope of free human choice and affords an opportunity for wider exercise of human intelligence in the direction of human affairs must, in the long run, be the source of progress toward human happiness. To be free to choose one's neighborhood is, then, a real gain, for it brings with it the possibility of choosing wisely; and that means shifting the whole matter of the relation of the neighborhood and the family from an accidental to an at least potentially intelligent basis. For those who are concerned with the future of the family, as an essential institution in human society, I cannot imagine a more significant or hopeful change.

The new neighborhood will be far less dependent than the old upon the accidents of geographical location, but it will inevitably have its geographical aspect. Even here, however, the element of choice is becoming very much larger, and this is the hopeful side of the phenomenon which we often deplore because it leads to so much nervous and senseless moving about. Freedom to move one's home, easily and quickly, for a good reason or for no reason at all except the whim of a restless spirit, is indeed inimical to that stability of location upon which the old neighborhood was largely founded. No tree can grow roots if it is constantly being pulled up and transplanted. But, on the other hand, this same freedom of movement makes it possible for a family to choose the location of

its dwelling-place in accordance with the special needs which, from time to time, develop within it. Supposing the changes of location to be made with some real measure of common sense behind them, is it not true that the mobility of the modern home might easily become a factor of considerable value in promoting the best interests of the family? Even from the merely geographical point of view, a neighborhood which has been deliberately selected is far more likely to become a real factor in the life of a family than one in which it is compelled to live. A little careful observation of the family life among our negro fellow citizens, who are for the most part denied the freedom of movement which is becoming so nearly universal otherwise, will, I think, bear out the truth of my contention. The geographical neighborhood, when it is a matter of accident or compulsion, is a far less helpful influence upon family life than when it is a matter of choice; and one of the most encouraging signs in our modern civilization is the extraordinary degree to which such freedom of choice is spreading, all up and down the social scale.

But the new neighborhood will not be primarily a geographical unit. Instead of starting with a group of people who happen to live near each other, and building up a set of common interests on that basis, it will begin with the common interests and let the matter of living near one another follow along behind. The difference may perhaps be made plain by an illustration. There was a time when folk-dancing was very common almost everywhere in England. Scarcely a village green anywhere but what the neighbors came together to dance upon it, but they came because they were neighbors who happened to want to dance. The last time I was in London I was invited to an

evening of folk-dancing in the social hall of a downtown church — one of a regular series of such evenings, to which men and women came from many sections of the great metropolis and from a surprising variety of social classes. These people came because they wanted to dance, not because they lived near each other; but as they danced together they began to become neighbors, no matter where they lived. There is still an intimate connection between folk-dancing and the neighborly spirit, but the character of the connection has changed. For my own part, I believe the change is in the direction of greater reality and vitality.

Not far from my own house there is a little church which has interested me for a good many years. The doctrine which it teaches might seem to some people fantastic and utterly incredible, but those who accept it are willing to make great sacrifices to maintain a place where it may be set forth. The little company of worshipers comes from every section of a city that extends over fifty square miles of territory. I cannot think of any church which is less of a neighborhood institution, in the old sense of the word; yet I have discovered that the neighborly spirit among those people has completely transcended the mere matter of geographical diffusion. They are not neighbors who go to the same church, but ardent church-goers who have become neighbors. And once again I believe the change has made the neighborhood a more real and vital factor in their individual and family lives.

These are illustrations of a movement within the social body that has almost infinite ramifications. Gradually there is coming about a rearrangement of social forces, with new starting-points and new directions; but the func-

tions of the old forces are not lost. They are being assumed, with greater promise of effectiveness, by the new forces. Everything which the old neighborhood did for the family can be done by the new neighborhood; and because the new neighborhood is primarily functional rather than geographical, because it may become intelligently rather than accidentally directed, there is reason to expect that the family will be served in a much more real and vital way.

Such a result depends, of course, upon the amount of intelligence which is actually brought into play in the creation and development of the new kind of neighborhood. What exists at the present moment is a potential rather than an actually operative 'new neighborhood,' and I want now to take up two or three concrete examples of this new sort of social influence, to point out some of the ways in which they might be more intelligently directed, and to make a plea for the sort of leadership which will make that result more probable.

Let me begin with one of the most recent and one of the most roundly abused of American institutions — the luncheon club. Mr. Mencken has tried his best to make it impossible for any one to take these clubs seriously, but the significant fact is that tens of thousands of American men — and still more recently a considerable number of American women — insist upon taking them with the utmost seriousness. Those of us who belong to such clubs have no sense of shame in confessing that we take our membership as seriously as Mr. George F. Babbitt would take it if he were eligible to election to our particular club. Nor do I consider that we thereby forfeit our claim to a modest amount of humor in our make-up. We take our luncheon clubs seriously because we enjoy them and be-

cause we believe in their principles, and I have a distinct feeling that our fellow members are more truly our neighbors than the people who merely happen to live in the same block with us.

Now when you stop to think of the power which is represented by the vast network of such organizations, you cannot escape the conviction that it must make an appreciable difference in the whole fabric of our social life how that power is exercised. When you see three or four hundred men, ordinarily self-conscious and conventional as perhaps only American men can be, forgetting their dignity and even their desire to maintain the outward appearance of dignity, you may be sure that they are under the domination of some force which no student of contemporary society can afford to ignore. Many an American city has begun to discover that when this force is directed into the channel of philanthropy it can, if wisely controlled, be of tremendous service. Too often, of course, it is sentimental rather than intelligent; but one of the most interesting things about it is the willingness with which it accepts intelligent leadership, provided that leadership is sufficiently intelligent to be sympathetic.

The bearing of all this upon family life may not be very apparent, but it is real and important. If fifty years ago, family life was to a considerable degree controlled by 'what the neighbors might think,' there is no reason to suppose that a similar control over family life might not be exercised by the opinions and judgments of the members of the newer kind of organization. How far such a control has already begun, I have no adequate evidence to say, but I think this is a topic which would repay careful investigation; and I have just enough knowledge of specific instances to lead me to guess that it has already

become a factor in the lives of many families. As a single instance of the potentialities which are lying at hand in this field, just suppose that by a careful and systematic campaign of education we could win the understanding support of the members of the luncheon clubs for the idea of the 'child guidance clinics' — not their financial support, but their moral support. It doesn't require much imagination to see what an enormous effect upon American family life would be the result. I happen on two occasions to have heard Dr. Smiley Blanton explain to luncheon club meetings the principles and methods of such a clinic; and the response which he received —not merely vague, impersonal interest in a fascinating subject, but specific and intimate concern with the practical bearing of the subject upon individual homes — was highly suggestive to observe.

The luncheon-clubs are predominantly men's organizations and they are, therefore, a natural supplement to another type of organization which is — thus far, at any rate — predominantly feminine in its working constituency. I mean the Parent-Teacher Associations. The rapidity with which these associations have grown, especially during the last few years, until to-day they are among the most powerful forces in the educational world, with well over a million members, organized into nearly twenty thousand local units, is sufficient testimony to the genuine need which they satisfy; but, curiously enough, their importance as an element in the environment of the family seems not to have been fully appreciated. At any rate, this aspect of the parent-teacher movement has received very little consideration at the hands of students of family life.

It is part of our American tradition that there is no-

thing in which the ordinary citizen is so much interested — so far as civic matters are concerned — as the school to which his children go; and the Parent-Teacher Associations have capitalized that interest with remarkable skill. The school is, obviously, the focus of their attention; but the reaction of all that they do upon the home is scarcely less plain. The educational campaign which they carry on continuously is chiefly directed toward educating the parents; and it is a most cleverly devised kind of education, based upon the sound principle of 'learning by doing.' Few organizations in recent years have made such admirable use of the practical teachings of psychology, and the result is that the Parent-Teacher Associations are to-day perhaps the most powerful single factor in creating the 'new neighborhood.'

The influence which these associations already exert upon family life is very great. They begin by urging the necessity of greater attention to the problems of children — health problems, behavior problems, moral problems, and, with admirable courage, religious problems. But no sensible person any longer imagines that the problems of children can be considered apart from family problems. In effect, then, the Parent-Teacher Associations are an influence upon family life, through the channel most easily opened. It would be difficult to imagine a more promising instrument for the sane and wise direction of family life, and any one who is concerned with the future of the family in America must make himself acquainted with the aims and principles, the achievements and possibilities, of these associations.

I have mentioned only two out of a very large number of similar influences which, taken together, constitute the 'new neighborhood,' and which, in their combined power,

might easily become the decisive factor in the future of family life. Let me just mention, in the briefest possible fashion, certain others among these forces. There are the fraternal organizations and orders, of an amazing variety in detail but all very much alike in their hold upon their members' allegiance. There are the labor unions, the professional organizations, the business and trade associations. There are the rapidly growing clubs for athletic and recreational purposes. Then, too, we must not overlook the development in the press — daily, weekly, and monthly — of a whole set of influences that have as their avowed aim the dissemination of knowledge about home life and the welfare of children. To the power of the written word, with the millions of readers of our popular periodicals, must be added the new power which the radio has given to the spoken word. Mr. H. G. Wells may tell us that 'the future of broadcasting is like the future of cross-word puzzles and Oxford trousers — a very trivial future indeed'; but some of us have discovered by our own experience that broadcasting has already become an influence that is far from trivial, and we may venture to think that for once, at any rate, Mr. Wells is likely to prove a mistaken prophet.

In all these multifarious agencies, there are certain common tendencies at work, not in equal degree in them all, but nevertheless to some extent present and active in each. All of these agencies are aware of the new scientific spirit, and all are at least beginning to see that in this spirit lies one of the main sources of human progress. All of them have been touched by the sense of social responsibility which is another of the characteristics of our modern world, and all of them have at least begun to realize that not to be socially minded is to be out of step

with the marching hosts. There is a willingness to learn — a sense of almost guilty ignorance — that is encouraging and sometimes rather appalling to those who are supposed to be the givers of knowledge and light. And in addition there is a growing sense of the importance of the direct, personal, 'human' factor, which is already giving to the 'new neighborhood' the quality of neighborliness, even in its most impersonal quarters. The director of a large broadcasting station might seem to be at the farthest possible point of remote, impersonal, unneighborly isolation; yet he will tell you stories that reveal how closely many of his scattered neighbors feel themselves bound to him in personal ties. The new neighborhood is beginning to be scientifically and socially minded, as the old neighborhood never was; and it is also plainly determined not to become a purely mechanical and impersonal thing.

But what remains, after all, the chief impression as we study this new neighborhood of our modern age is the sense of almost unlimited power which is as yet very little controlled and directed. Mr. Canby, writing of the younger generation in the field of literature, speaks of their 'expansiveness,' and compares it to the rush of water from a hydrant. The power is there all right, but so much of it is being wasted! 'What is needed is a hose,' he says, 'to stop the waste of literary energy, to conserve and direct it.' And then he adds this word of caution: 'Call for a hose, then, as much as you please, but do not try to stop the waters with your Moses' rod of conservative indignation.'

Combating the conservative indignation that relies on magic may not be so necessary in the field of social engineering as in the field of literature, but the need for con-

serving and directing the stream of expansive idealism is most assuredly as great. The power is there — more exuberant and eager, more amenable to leadership, more capable of following intelligent direction, I believe, than ever before. That power is sufficient to surround the family with an environment far more rationally planned and far more wisely controlled than has ever been possible in the past. The power is there, and the desire to use it rightly; but at the present moment the waste is much more evident than the effective use. What is needed is that the leaders should rise to the responsibility that is theirs and turn the waste energy to useful work. The future of the American family lies in the hands of those who, by virtue of training and experience, are best fitted to provide sensible leadership in creating the new environment in which the family shall live. Whether we possess intelligence enough to be such leaders, remains to be seen. If we fail, it will not be due to lack of opportunity, or to any want of idealism, but to a failure to *think* with sufficient rigor and patience and breadth of mind, so that idealism may be transformed into realistic planning and action.

XI

RELIGION AND FAMILY LIFE

RUFUS M. JONES

THE more we learn about childhood, the more clearly we see that the earliest period of life — even the first year — is the crucial time for the shaping of the deepest elemental roots of human personality. Imagination, wonder, reverence, and awe underlie the child's normal religious attitudes and all these mental traits begin at the very dawn of consciousness. If spiritual culture is to fit the unfolding steps of the natural development of the child, it must, consequently, be pushed far back toward the headwaters of the child's life. It is thus primarily a problem and a task for the family, and only secondarily for the school and the church.

If the family is found wanting as a nursery of this vital spiritual culture, the failure is bound to involve serious consequences in the shaping of the destiny of the newborn life, while the ultimate effects, as we know only too well, stretch out far beyond the range of the individual life. It is a business which deeply concerns the spiritual health and welfare of society and the state as well. I have no miraculous solution of the problem of the child's religion to propose. There are no Aladdin's lamps for us to rub. There is no magic wand to wave; no mystic spell will come to our help. The family life in America must first of all be saved and restored to its divine functions and then the solution will be within our reach.

Whether we realize it or not, we are building a new

kind of civilization. We have tapped new forces. We have girdled the globe with lines of travel and traffic. We have surpassed the prophecies of Shakespeare's Puck with our magical methods of intercommunication. We send our radio message through mountains as easily as over prairies. We fly over wastes of ocean as though we had suddenly got the wings of cherubim. We can locate the resources of the earth by electrical devices without any of the uncertainty of boring or digging.

None of these things, however, will, I believe, fill the center of the picture in the long perspective view of it. What the historian will see in our world will be the fact of the common man's invasion of rights and privileges that in all previous ages had been kept exclusively for a chosen few. The man with no crest and with no pedigree has started to knock at every door of opportunity, and the doors have opened to his challenge. The ancient mysteries of life and death with which science has been busy are now 'open secrets.' They are no longer kept for the laboratory. They are familiar to the school boy and the reader of the newspaper. The more primitive races, too, know how to control life and how to destroy it by methods undreamed of a century ago. The vast multitudes of laborers in all fields of activity are organized and are guided and directed by leaders from among themselves.

Literature is no longer produced for the benefit of a rare and scholarly class of readers. It is produced for the rank and file. Naturally, the quality of the output has greatly altered as a result of the immense extension of the *clientèle.* The novel has come to rank as the foremost literature of our age and its influence probably now surpasses that of any other type of literary production. The theater was once a place of entertainment and culture for the élite of

society; now it is the playhouse for the entire city-public. The purveyors of entertainment appeal to all social and intellectual levels, and obviously this inclusive widening of ticket-buyers has changed the tone and character of the play. Art, too, has captured a new public. Creative genius aims to attract the whole world and no longer a tiny fraction of it. The Sunday supplement and the evening edition with its comic strips, pay their artists larger sums each year than Michelangelo or Raphael received for the work of a lifetime. Necessarily, the quality is different. The modern picture is not for the holy shrine; it is an ephemeral production for the thousands or the millions to see. The newspaper reveals more clearly than any other modern phenomenon the extraordinary invasion of the people. The newspaper is made not alone for the nice-minded and the pure-minded. It is a composite production for the entire public. Here, everybody is supposed to be 'at home.' It is a strange being who cannot find some food for his appetite in the extensive pages of a daily newspaper!

All these transformations have given us a new kind of world. It is intricate, complex, involved, tangled, confused. The methods and the forces which organized and controlled the simpler social order of a century ago are wholly inadequate to-day. We have increased the size, speed, and tonnage of the ship, but we have not correspondingly enlarged its rudder or improved its steering facilities. The time has come for us to wake up and look straight at the facts. We cannot avoid serious catastrophe unless we deepen the foundations of our social structure. It is top-heavy and not built with a plumb-line. By some wiser methods we must find out how to increase the moral and spiritual forces that build good, solid, trustworthy

individual lives and that, at the same time, construct and integrate the social organism, which can hardly be expected to be much better than the units that compose it. The situation calls, I think, for a profound reorganization of all our educational methods and systems from the pre-kindergarten to the university graduate schools. We need to shift the point of emphasis from the supply of information to the formation of life and character.

But the new focus in education is not my present subject. I am now concerned with the formative spiritual forces of family life, without which no educational methods or systems will ever be quite adequate. Wherever there has been profound religious life in any nation, race, or people, there has always been behind it a deep and pervasive piety and religious culture in the home. Jewish religion has been born, in all periods, not in the synagogue but in the family center. Puritan faith had its nurture around the family hearth. Quakerism has lived and flourished only where the home was the nursery of its spirit and its ideals. The child of the seasoned Quaker learns to pray in silence and to practice meditation in the family before joining in these ways of worship in the larger group at the meeting-house.

The first step toward rebuilding our new society is in the direction of the recovery of a truer and more vital spiritual quality in the home. The influences in the atmosphere and spirit that the child unconsciously breathes by day and by night are the deepest forces that shape his destiny. He is a born imitator. The muscular movements of his face and hands instinctively follow the patterns and copies set before him on other faces and in other bodies. His first ideas and his budding ideals have their ground and origin in the thoughts, acts and suggestions

of those nearest to him. Until the day of his death, he will carry within himself an inner psychological climate which the family weather, with its calms and storms, its pressures and its vortexes, its warm currents and its misty clouds, has unconsciously shaped in his plastic mind.

It will be said, no doubt, that the recovery of a vital spiritual quality in the home is a hopeless quest. The modern Macbeth has not only 'murdered sleep,' but he has killed out all possibility of having time for hush and quiet at home, or time and patience for the task of initiating into faith and love and joy the little ones who 'come trailing clouds of glory, from God who was their home.' The complexity of life, we are told, is the pitiless foe of spiritual culture. The automobile is said to be a vehicle which assists the devil and all his works and militates against all the fruits of the spirit. Bridge, golf, exercise, play, sport, recreation, dancing, aeroplaning, skiing, mountain climbing: these are the gods of the present hour and they are the stern rivals of all religious attitudes which enjoin sacrifice, unselfish love, and the old-fashioned virtues.

Well, I, for one, do not believe that human nature has become vitiated and depraved. I cannot admit that 'complexity of life' has altered man's fundamental nature which is, I still maintain, essentially spiritual. Mechanistic theories of life have most assuredly worked serious harm and materialistic tendencies have, of course, made religious ideals seem to many less live and gripping verities. But the best leaders of present-day thought are swinging away from mechanistic interpretation, and the growing emphasis on the fact that spiritual values are also a part of the eternal nature of things in our universe will in the near future break the drift of materialism. I

see many signs of returning sanity and I am confident that the native hunger of the human soul for God will reassert itself and bring social health and healing.

The waning and decline of religion in any epoch is usually due to a reaction against crude and inadequate formulations and interpretations of religion. The persons who are saying to-day that they do not believe in God only mean that they do not believe in the kind of God they have heard preached about. They apparently do believe that there is a rational basis to the universe and that there is a moral and spiritual structure underlying the unfolding processes of history. They may not believe in the creedal statements about Christ but they feel in their deepest being that He is beautiful and loving enough to satisfy their ideal of what the divine should be. And that is a good point from which to build up a positive living faith.

Even now any book which gives a fresh, powerful interpretation of religion becomes a 'best seller' and it is significant that eight million copies of the New Testament were sold last year. Let the churches stop contentions over dead issues and petty questions and turn all their energies to present-day constructive interpretations of a religion of life, and the fathers and mothers of little children will quickly show a revival of interest in those things which most deeply concern the spiritual culture of their offspring. The wide-spread loss of interest in religion is mainly due to the general prevailing confusion on the subject. It seems to many persons like a hopeless muddle. It sounds to them like words and jargon. It does not function. It opens no doors of life. It kindles no enthusiasm. It promotes no daring adventures. It adds no new dimensions to the soul. The critical situation which now

prevails in our homes is not due to the perversity of parents nor, primarily, to the complexity of life. It is due in large measure to the lack of insight, inspiration, leadership, and adventurous faith in those who should be the guides and prophets of religion in the world to-day. The first turn in the tide will come when the leaders within the church or perhaps the spiritual prophets outside the fold, wake up to the fact that the homes of America must be made nurseries of a sound, healthy moral and religious life if we expect to build a permanent and advancing civilization.

What type of religious life do we want to see cultivated in the homes of our nation? If we were talking about the cultivation of art instead of religion, we should emphasize the importance of the love of beauty in the family circle, a pervasive good taste in the home and the surrounding presence of beautiful objects, harmonious colors and a fitting setting for continual unconscious suggestions of loveliness and charm. That would work much more effectively than would the frequent discussion of theories of beauty, or occasional lectures on form, or a well-selected library of books on æsthetics. The same features apply to religious culture. Discussions of creeds and doctrines are not the important matters. Religious attitudes in the child count for much more than do specific beliefs. Habits of reverence and of wonder, once formed, are likely to last through life, whereas ideas and thoughts are, and should be, transitory. They have their day and cease to be. The child ought not to be a little theologian. He ought to be a joyous little child, full of spontaneous enthusiasms and growing loyalties. George McDonald has beautifully expressed the natural spiritual reactions of a normal child:

I am a little child and I
Am ignorant and weak;
I gaze into the starry sky
And then I cannot speak.

For all behind the starry sky,
Behind the world so broad,
Behind men's hearts and souls doth lie
The infinite of God.

I do not believe that picture is overdrawn or greatly idealized. None of us believes any more that the newborn child is totally depraved. He is not a little brute. He is not a mere bunch of instincts. He has spiritual potentialities and he is quick to respond to the appeal of the divine which is always within reach. Professor Otto of Marburg has been showing that the religious experience is as natural for a child as is hunger or play. He is aware of something beyond himself. He has a mysterious feeling of some higher presence, a consciousness of more than he sees or touches. Sometimes it is a hushed and tremulous state which comes over him. Sometimes it is charged with awe and wonder. Sometimes it is an over-brimming, over-abounding emotion. It is what Browning means when he says:

The child
Feels God a moment, ichors o'er the place,
Plays on and grows to be a man like us.

These overbrimming experiences made primitive man a religious being and they make the little child to-day natively disposed to religion.

Whether he 'ichors o'er the place' and 'plays on' like any case-hardened man, or opens out his spiritual possibilities like a flower in the sun, will depend a good deal on whether he discovers that his family carries that line

of higher interests or is cold to them. We are coming more and more to realize that religion attaches to the simple, elemental aspects of our human life. We shall not look for it in a few rare, exalted and so-called sacred aspects of life, separated off from the rest of life and raised to a place apart. Religion to be real and vital must be rooted in life itself and it must express itself through the whole of life. It should therefore begin, where all effective education must begin, in the home, which should be the nursery of spiritual life.

A home penetrated with spiritual culture and spiritual ideals is the highest product of civilization and it in turn ministers all the time toward the creation of a still higher civilization. In fact there is nothing of what we mean by civilization where the home is wanting. The savage is on his way out of savagery and barbarity as soon as he can create a home and make family life at all sacred. The real horror of the slums in our great cities is that there are no homes there, only human beings crowded indiscriminately into one room. Our present society will be well on its way out of the existing moral chaos as soon as the home is restored and rededicated to its true spiritual functions.

The home is the true unit of society. It determines more than any other one influence, and perhaps more than all influences combined, what the destiny of the boy or girl shall be. It shapes the social life; it makes the church possible; it is the true basis of the state and nation. Men and women each for self, with no holy center of family life, could never compose either a church or a state. The woman who is successful in making a true home and nursery of spiritual culture, where peace and love dwell, and in which the children whom God gives her feel the sacredness and holy meaning of life, has won the best crown

there is in this life and she has served the world in a very high degree. Some day perhaps the men, too, will discover that this home-base, which is the center of all that is best and most valuable in their lives, is not alone a woman's task but deserves from the husband and father the same intelligent and devoted attention that his business ventures receive.

We moderns have the habit of conquering difficulties, of succeeding with great adventures, of daring to try what seems impossible. Has not the time come to apply that spirit and that attitude to other conquests than those of space and matter? That same determination of purpose which has cleared the virgin forests of this continent, made the deserts blossom like the rose and tapped for daily use the inexhaustible resources of nature can recover and revitalize the home and make it once more the nursery of souls.

PART V

FAMILY SOCIAL WORK LOOKS FORWARD AND BACK

XII

THE CONTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL CASE WORK TO MODERN LIFE

GORDON HAMILTON

NOT long ago, a woman went to a family welfare agency for help. Her husband had been drinking heavily for several years, and every one in the home was suffering from the resulting emotional and economic tension. Nothing dramatic ensued. Congenial part-time work outside the home was found for the wife, which tended to relieve the strain. The two high school children were helped to choose and find jobs, and the husband was persuaded to go to a psychiatrist for treatment. Slowly there emerged a more stable family life, with a better understanding by all of the causes of the past difficulty, of the assets which might be discovered in their family relationships, and the ways in which their several abilities might better be harmonized and developed.

Such a story illustrates modern case work procedure in a number of ways. One might say, for instance, that there were problems of insufficient income, marital friction, parent-child friction, alcoholism, which were treated with some skill and with success. One might count the cost of such treatment — so much in relief, so much in skilled service. One might try to measure the successes and failures by some measuring rod and so account for the contributions made by social case work. I wish to note only one aspect of the circumstances. Through a period of two years a case worker attended this family in

all its troubles and vicissitudes until the family ceased to need her services. In much the same way did the old-fashioned practitioner attend his patients.

There is nothing new, singular or startling in the emphasis of social case work, yet there is something significant in the close concern of the case worker with the family. The word that suggests itself for this relationship is *participation*. Is it perhaps true that social case work because of its participation in these family groups can help us see a little more clearly in what ways family life is more than a bare sequence of events which may take this or that chance direction, and how the members of families may be made more effective in meeting the demands of modern affairs? It is always easier to possess ourselves of quantitative concepts than of values, but it is in the field of values that case work assumes to make its peculiar contribution.

One can ask many questions about the family. How did it originate? What is its purpose? The present generation is inclined to add, 'What good is it anyway?' Social case work varies this question a little and asks, 'What is its good?' and perhaps this significant further question — 'Are we using this family good scientifically; are we using it to its fullest value?'

Now social work, like every other educational or scientific adventure, must begin by accumulating material, much of it irrelevant. Later, it must rationalize this material if possible; later still, and in addition to the processes of reason, social case work, like all creative effort, must 'begin to have great intuitions,' if its contribution is to have any significance. As Dr. Richard Cabot has truly said, we know more about human beings than we know about anything else. Yet social work is far from

having completed its fact-finding stage. Impressive as are some of our data on court, playground, school and home, we have scarcely scratched the surface of what we need to know. Is it too soon to talk of social work intuitions? Critics of the social sciences maintain that they can never be true, as the exact sciences are thought to be, because in the social sciences, and especially in social work, the investigator enters so completely into the observation — the experiment must include the maker of the experiment. How then reason about the experiment? And is not intuition still more insecure?

Reason, we are told, depends on a balanced and proportionate emotion, or sensitiveness. While emotional balance is not easily derived from social data, it may be derived, we believe, through the corrective of *sufficient exposure.* It is in fact only through exposure that one can achieve this proportionate sensitiveness. The important thing about social work is that it is *social;* its facts, perceptions, reasons, and intuitions lie within, not without, social relationships. Relations of cause and effect, obscure as they are in the area of interacting personalities, can be approached to some extent quantitatively by the aid of social statistics. The task of collecting and classifying life data is not simple; yet granting the blockings of prejudice, vital interest, moral judgments and so on; granted, too, the imperfections of case record material as at present demonstrated, there is something positive as well as negative, strategic as well as perilous, in the position of the case worker.

Some sociologists have asserted that there can be no laboratory in this field — that social experimentation must be carried on in the realm of the imagination. This is surely not true. The most significant thing about any

experience is having it, and the next most significant thing is being able to reflect upon it. In an immediate sense the social worker lives his way into his thinking. He does not experiment on people but he shares a certain experience with people. The ability of human beings to interpenetrate and yet maintain awareness is the germ of the matter. It is possible not only to have the experience but to think about it; not only to have it but to evaluate it. Natural science does not teach us to prefer one end result to another, but religion, philosophy, æsthetics and perhaps also the social sciences, are inevitably concerned with preferences and values. Here is the point in which social case work is beginning to play a small rôle, but a definite one in helping to comprehend and determine the values in social relationships: and in trying to bring about understanding and self-directing in place of fatalistic and haphazard activity. The final test of any truth lies in 'its experienced agreement with fact.' The first intuition of social case work is that out of shared creative experiences, and the rationalizing of those experiences, one has direct apperception of social values, which can be gained in no other way.

In the early days of social work, there was sometimes a tendency, I believe, to regard its activities as commodities which could be given or withheld. One built a settlement and offered it to a congested, saloon-ridden neighborhood; one mobilized some patriotic principles or some classes in English and offered Americanization to the immigrant; one mobilized economic resources and offered organized charity to an aimless, drifting benevolence. Social workers were particularly concerned with an institution called 'the family' and a commodity called 'the home.' But social work has been slowly moving away from com-

modities. It has also become less interested in categories and labels, such as poverty and delinquency; increasingly it has become preoccupied with habits as well as events, with persons as well as with problems. 'It is more important to know what sort of patient has a disease than what sort of disease a patient has,' said Osler.

As social work has continued to extend from one area of human existence to another, it has left symbols of its presence and special interests. The family case worker, probation officer, recreation worker, visiting teacher, hospital and psychiatric workers mark almost with dates, trends and purposes. The characteristic motif introduced by each phase of case work was, however, always the same, that is to do away with wholesaling wherever it exists in human relationships. It is hard to estimate what the totality of these experiences signifies — the home, the school, the workshop, the hospital, visited and revisited, lived in and observed — by social workers. There is an intuition that arises from repeated association with runaway children, broken marriages, or frustrated people, which academic science so often seems to ignore; there are discernible common and uncommon factors in these relationships and through shared creative experience it is possible to release the forces that lie in personality.

This intuition as to the potential release of personality challenges some of the economic determinism of the past, or indeed some of the more extreme behavioristic or psychological determinism of to-day. Important as are good wages, fair labor arrangements, or conditioned reflexes in their several ways, they are not guarantees of what the social worker is inclined to call adjustment. Better heredity and a more controlled environment are naturally indispensable to progress but the individual has still to be

taught not only to develop but to attune himself. In a recent French book by Henri Barbusse, the grasshopper, when his strong legs are admired, says, 'It is the earth that throws me into the air.' This idea, exploited as it has been by success propaganda of various kinds has in it a germ of reality. Through participation, through creative social experience, personality can be developed and adjusted.

Social case workers, operating with mothers' allowances, foster homes and sharing in so many intimate relationships, observing or taking part in disintegrating and rebuilding processes, may have come to feel too readily that the values and limitations in family living can be known, analyzed and in a measure utilized. These processes are subtle and complex indeed, and although we do believe that much is known and much more can be known through the methods of social case work, we should be rash to make many definite assertions or to try to draw too precise conclusions. Nor are the methods of case work, as we still most awkwardly call it, characteristic of social work alone. Lawyers, doctors, ministers, teachers, parents, friends — many of these, consciously or unconsciously, use such methods. It is only by reason of the degree of familiarity with these methods that case workers have any right to claim the distinctive technique which more and more is being recognized. But it is because of this very familiarity with recurring patterns in the family and exact ways of studying them that social work has a word to say on the question of family change so much under discussion to-day.

Many are quick to state that we of to-day are a lost generation, that the family as such will go or must go or is half gone already. The movies, the cities, the newspaper

comics, the greater mobility of population, social work itself, are all accused of taking part in the breakdown of the family. Birth control, companionate marriages, state institutions of many kinds are recommended to replace parental failures. Some of the great mediæval artists are said to have painted their madonnas while kneeling, but one must admit to-day that the family has been taken out of its sacred niche and cut away from its supporting liturgy. Pressures from relatives and racial groups, as well as religious sanctions, have been withdrawn or softened. As never before, the family is being tested from within.

Yet there are still traditionalists who regard the family as an indestructible unit, who would stereotype and mould it by rigid authority and censorship. They believe in unquestioning obedience for obedience' sake, duties and indissolubilities and repressions, all under the ægis of the family for the family's sake. In older variants of the family there was a solidity resting partly on the number of the permanent *dependents* within the family circle. The wife, grown daughters, unmarried relatives, slaves — and, in some civilizations, guests — were part of the picture. The young married couple shared their problems willingly or unwillingly with a large number of interested kinsmen. In the modern family, relatives less frequently play dominating rôles. Children may, in fact, play 'leads' under conditions not always healthy. It is not so much, however, that relatives have stepped out as that society has stepped in. Family responsibility has not turned to irresponsibility but by and large there is a more diffused social responsibility. This social responsibility should bring with it more elasticity, more interaction, more encouragement of individual differences, more real sense of the whole, a stronger and finer community structure.

One of the intuitions then arising from social work practice tells us that we need not worry so much about family disintegration or reorganization. No one knows better than social workers how hard it is genuinely to modify a family, let alone do away with it: if the people who are now so alarmed or rejoiced over the breakdown of the family unit would only try their hands at changing a few families radically, they would be astonished. As a vigorous organism, capable of slow but of almost unlimited adaptation, the family can hardly be excelled — and this too the social worker knows.

Social work has had its period of rigidity and traditionism, as it has had the period of commodities. It has tried to mould families into classic groups in a genuine spirit of serving important and beautiful ends. So also did traditional education work for conformity, and both together are now realizing that the type, the mould, the average, cannot be insisted on without disaster. We must start from where the individual is and with what he has — physically, intellectually, emotionally. So too with the family. We no longer speak of preserving the family but of developing the family. And by this we do not mean turning it into some model family, but helping each family to grow as well as it can in terms of its own needs and the positive contribution which it can make to the community.

The family, like the individual, can fixate at childish levels of development, or, like the individual, can develop, mature, socialize outwards. We know — and this is, for instance, one of the assertions reasonably well tested by social work — that the emotionally immature father or mother will probably create for the children conditions that make for immaturity and uneven develop-

ment, not growth or social interdependence. We are realizing as we study this socializing process, more and more, that the family exists for purposes beyond itself. It is not merely a useful, self-protective biological structure. It is a complex of organized and, at its best, deeply educated, and in turn, educational, attitudes.

In a family I know there are two little girls, the elder of whom, Helen, is especially talented, with a dominating drive born out of superior intelligence and powerful emotional equipment. Everything in her small personality from babyhood on has been tensely mobilized for success. Her parents, and her school, with much patient understanding, have tried to teach her ways of graciousness and generosity but the small dynamo is still highly charged. Into this setting came a younger sister, a sprite — a creature of laughter and charm. For her, life has no hills, no sloughs of despond, no difficulties. Obstacles that call forth all the older's strength are passed by or under or over by the younger. Everything that is storm and stress in the older is ease and gaiety in the younger. In the early years there was no love wasted by the older child on her usually irritating companion.

One spring, however, there were school games. The younger won without effort. The older, characteristically determined to excel in at least one event, had practiced for weeks in the back yard. She too won. As the children reached home, the younger ran up the stairs calling out, 'Mother, mother, I have such good news — such good news — Helen has won her race!' She had thought of Helen's triumph first. The older child stood at the foot of the stairs, arrested, transfixed. Something new came into her expression. For the first time she was made conscious out of her tense individualism of the emotional

backing that lies at the heart of family life. The little lesson in generosity so unconsciously given took root. The socializing process was begun.

For the past thirty years and more social work has been attempting not only to study the patterns in successfully achieved family life, but has also been attempting to evolve methods and techniques which might be, in part at least, carried over; made available for the less successful individual and family. By far the greater number of people make their own adjustments, solve their own problems, create their own immunities, but there is always a percentage who fall below the norm in economic or emotional balance or in their behavior.

At first the methods used by different types of case workers in dealing with these unadjusted individuals and families were inclined to be, or at least to seem, widely dissimilar. The family field, the children's field, the group workers, the psychiatric workers, suffered from excessive angularities and isolations, on which, as is the way of pioneering, they rather quaintly prided themselves. Each was eager to be regarded as a specialist before enough was known about even the simplest phenomena to justify their claims. Each generalized from insufficient returns, disregarded important evidence and set up premature dogmas in place of humble curiosities. But true to the principles of sound development, after the scattered fact-finding stage there has been slowly growing a body of knowledge as to some of the commoner patterns of individual differences and human behavior, by which new suggestions can be tested. Since we come to realize that, like Alice in 'Through the Looking-Glass,' it took almost all our running just to stay in the same place, the intolerance of partial understanding has been giving way to

sharing of all that could be collectively found or interpreted. Not only the different case workers among themselves but community workers and those interested in social research have been drawing nearer together till social work as a definite activity is beginning to emerge. To-day the well equipped social worker is conversant with the methods of case work, research, and certain aspects of community organization. It is not enough that social work be practiced; it must be continually explored, weighed, and tested. More than any other one event, the publication of 'Social Diagnosis' just ten years ago tended to bring case work out of amateur chaotic method on to the high road of professional advancement. It is due in great part to Mary E. Richmond that we are able to say to-day that there is a common stock of procedures and that there are basic principles of case work. Possibly the most important recent development in social work is the gradual replacing of social sectarianism by the social worker trained in those few fundamental techniques which we may dare to claim.

Next in importance to the growth in unity and the discoveries of common general methods, I should place a marked change in the approach to social problems. The older case work was not only authoritative but it was inclined to be 'cosmic' in its scope. The study of the family situation often revealed a great many problems, and early crusading case work was for tilting at each problem in turn — alcoholism, desertion, feebleminded-ness, heart disease and so on down the alphabet. A good 'case' as we were wont to use the term meant the one to which the greatest number of carefully listed services was rendered. Service might be given freely, though we were a little wary of charity's stepchild, that we so unluckily had named 'relief.'

In any event there was a sort of A-rating case work service, which was possibly the product of the so-called family field. This extensive and intensive development of service coupled with equally thorough investigation — in both of which directions the 'family field' offered outstanding leadership — certainly helped explore the problems involved and laid the foundations of better and more scientific treatment, but in the last five years has come a change in approach toward what we might regard as the project method. The modern case worker, like the modern educator, sees in the family situation, not a long list of problems, nor even a long list of potential services but several positive projects which bring the family's capacities into play. Solving even the simplest, leads the family towards the goal of self-maintenance. The project method in case work removes the incubus of the sense of chronic unaccomplishment perpetually haunting the case worker; it lays the ghost of the old skeleton — should one investigate without consent? It cuts across some of the ethical puzzles, for case work can hardly help but be ethical if it genuinely seeks the fullest participation of the client in a whole educational process. Case work seeks not to do things for people or to people and still less behind their backs, but to enlist the desires of the client for success, happiness, recognition, and adventure through some project or projects which will make for an educational experience and tend to release his latent forces.

The social worker is too close to personality to despair of personality; too close to family living to despair of family living. We do not dwell in a vacuum. We live in and through our environment and in improving our environment we catch glimpses of new and possible social interrelations and values. 'Through conflict and the reso-

lution of conflict, we set new and higher goals for our discontents.' Industry, long unfriendly to case work, is coming to see that what the social worker is striving to bring to the conduct of family or individual affairs is essentially the same as the goal set for industry — that is, to bring about the conduct of business so that the desires of men will find expression in socialized values.

The project idea contains within itself another intuition of social case work, although many of its critics do not yet understand the meaning. Why bother so much with the individual, they say, when the socio-economic structure is all wrong? Case work is too slow, too palliative, it is too much in the nature of patchwork. This charge is not true. The trouble with case work is not that it is too slow — it is not slow enough. It is not that it is too minute — it is not yet minute enough. Our perceptions, our measures, our gauges are still too wide, too large. The case work situation is the slide that we must put under the microscope. What we learn there has an infinite number of implications. An intuition of social work insists that we shall find in each case work situation, each family situation, the nodes of a full educational process. We do not of course understand all the individual differences in the whole of social relationships. It is enough that we are realizing that the extraordinary differentiations in family structure and behavior are valuable and can be used for 'everyman's' progress. Social reform does not owe its being alone to broad legislation or to wide-flung educational drives. Social reform has too a still small voice taught in the inflections of patient, accurate, case work observations and discoveries.

The development of the family and of the individual is

bound up with society. The responses of others do affect the meaning of what we do, and our acts affect others. 'Conduct,' as John Dewey says, 'is forever socially conditioned or socially saturated.' Each piece of adjustment done for the least of us is done for all. Just as the individual is the touchstone of the family, so the family is the touchstone of the community, and so outwards into socialized national and international fellowship. To this the present generation is deeply challenged. Chains have been cut, drawbridges are down, our innermost beliefs have been invaded. What is being put before us as social workers is not — here is a commodity, find facts and experiences to fit it; but — here are facts and experiences, the meaning of which we must find by training and discipline. Not, here is a tradition to be upheld, but there is a process which may illumine existence for all of us.

As we set forth these intuitions, we realize, in spite of all our faith and courage, that they are tenuous and frail. Are these things enough to motivate us — that through the interpenetration of case work and the sharing of creative experience we can help in the understanding and development of human relationships; that social case work research is laying some stones in the quantitative and qualitative valuation of social data; that because of their nearness to individual and family living, case workers are taking some responsibility and some leadership in facing the problems and possibilities of family life; that there are principles of basic case work and that these principles and the techniques arising out of them can be extended to other areas of human experience? Is it enough that we work so long and patiently, even though beset with failures, at the slow processes of individual adjustment, because we share an intuition, by no means recently

evolved, but made more certain through the thousands of case work situations in which social workers have participated — as to ways of creating higher values in life lived together? They say the atom has in it such energy, that could it be exploded, the power would suffice for the purposes of industry. The social worker believes that the unit, personality, as men come to understand more and more the means of releasing it, has the power, in a true sense, to socialize our world. Whitehead has stated the reason for this last intuition so beautifully that I cannot forbear to quote him here: 'God is that function in the world by reason of which our purposes are directed to ends which in our own consciousness are impartial as to our own interests. He is that element in virtue of which our purposes extend beyond values for ourselves to values for others. He is that element in virtue of which the attainment of such a value for others transforms itself into a value for ourselves. He is the binding element in the world. The consciousness which is individual in us is universal in Him; the love which is partial in us is all embracing in Him. Apart from Him there could be no world because there could be no adjustment of individuality. His purpose in the world is quality of attainment. In the actual world He confronts what is actual in it with what is possible for it. Thus He solves all indeterminations.'

XIII

THE DYNAMIC ASPECTS OF LIBERTY AND CONTROL

FRANK J. BRUNO

WHAT has social work to say about the family? The answer has been given throughout this conference. May I suggest a brief and tentative summary? In the first place, it is quite clear from our experience, backed up here as everywhere else by an abundance of so-called 'common-sense evidence' that success in family life does not depend upon any external excellencies or resources; but upon its degree of integration. Culture does not secure it. Even ability to think straight on the part of both parents does not guarantee it. The craziest or most erroneous ideas held by parents and taught by them to their children may not injure the texture of a particular family. This is particularly important to remember, in view of the tremendous developments in child-training skills. All the skills in the world may not help the strength of family life. Skills, resources, and amenities enrich and strengthen the family only as they are incorporated into its life. This is but a negative way of insisting upon the well-known fact that the family has a social entity of its own; its strength varies with the degree of close integration of its ideals, religion, aims and interests, not upon the quality of these characteristics. That is why it is possible to use that very dangerous analogy, a living organism, when we speak of a family. It is

a self-sustaining unit, determining what it will receive and what reject; placing the stamp of its individuality upon the raw material which it absorbs from its environment. Not so much that which surrounds a family determines what it will be as does the nature of its interrelationships. Therefore, in any study of family weakness, or of strength for that matter, the environment of the family tells us something; but only the gross affairs, such as starvation or luxury; education or illiteracy. To know the family one must find out how it takes these experiences into its vital processes and works them over into its life. On this point we are fairly certain of our data, but have scarcely a guess as to how it is brought about. We speak of one family as good, another as bad; one as strong, another as weak; one as a rich source of inspiration to its members, another as a desert containing only death. But these are subjective judgments in the first place; and even if we could agree upon the definitions, we should have almost no way to determine the how or the why. These are tasks for our successors.

We may be in darkness regarding the reason, but the facts stare us in the face. When irreconcilable streams meet in the family, running parallel but not fusing into a unity, its children are left socially undernourished, or, if I may change my figure of speech, they are cheated out of a certain birthright without which their own integration is neglected at certain points. Parents of different religious faiths, unless one of them by consent or events maintains a dominant position, bring us children of no faith. Parents of different cultural heritages have great difficulty in passing either of them intact over to their children. But more tragic is the conflict created by a difference between the culture of the parents and the culture

in which the child is reared. It has for some time been a commonplace that the real problem with immigration is not the immigrant, but his American born and American educated children. In such a situation fundamental flaws are introduced into the unity of family life. It does not make any difference whether the Italian mother is right or wrong in her judgment of what her young daughter should do; nor is the situation any better if the daughter is right in her conduct, as judged by all American standards. Right and wrong have lost their meaning. The social fact is that instead of integration of family life we have conflict; instead of growing together insensibly into a vital unity, we have continuous conflicts. Of course, they may be solved; a very wise parent, or an unusually submissive child may make the necessary adjustment. But they are solved only when one of them attempts to realize some sort of unity by suppressing the natural development of her ideal.

In the next place, one of the most striking findings of social case work, and one which comes nearer to being its own than any other, is that one of the most important, possibly the most important of all conditions for success in family life is continuity of its membership. Child-placing agencies have shown that it is better to spend time and money in trying to make a present home fit for the child, than to transfer it to another, even though to a much better one. Prentice Murphy, at the Providence Conference made a statement, as I remember it, that 'if one tenth of the money which has been spent in taking children from their homes and trying to fit them into new and better ones had been diverted toward keeping together the homes in which they were born, some real advance in social welfare might have been recorded.' It

would seem that integration of family life is a matter of slow growth; but given the chance, it will develop. Again, the analogy of the living organism suggests itself. Grafting, transplanting, pruning are surgical operations. Strength for the organism is secured only by allowing it to grow. The longer the life flows through its connected parts the stronger the integration becomes; and the more healthy it becomes, the more successfully does the organism perform its functions. The child and, to a lesser extent, the parent who is not transplanted from one home to another develops a wholesome ingenuousness by which he takes things for granted, is not too self conscious of his strengths and weaknesses, acquires a sense of belonging there in the very nature of things. Changing from one home to another challenges all these elemental attitudes, creates an interest in self, which may become even morbid. Many an oft-placed child has come to look upon himself as an 'interesting case.' Naturalness and spontaneity have become impossible.

This has nothing to do with happiness or cultural richness of a home. It may be an unhappy home; it may be a poor one; it may be an ignorant one; there may be a member in it whose influence is bad. But to these influences, as to the better ones, its members more or less unconsciously adjust themselves. It can be done, if the home is continuous. What that means in training future man and woman in adjustability to difficult social conditions we can easily guess. But the continuous home will do it; it maintains its unity, absorbing into its strong life even these unpleasant elements of its existence. You remember how Robert Frost said,

> Home is the place where, when you have to go there,
> They have to take you in.

The poet leads us to think of ourselves as the prodigal returning to a not too enthusiastic home. For our purposes, it is better to change rôles, and think of ourselves — or of the home — as the none too enthusiastic welcomers, but at the same time as taking the prodigal in as a matter of course.

You can easily see here that we are dealing with relative values. There is much to be said on the other side; the duty of self expression, and of individual right to development in accordance with the best educational and cultural ideals obtainable, the importance of being objective about ourselves, and of appraising friends and foes with even justice. I am not quarreling with that side; I merely wish to point out that individualism has little to teach us about the function of the family; that its sources of strength, the conditions of its life are different and, perhaps, not so highly or so consciously prized in this day of great individual and material advancement as in former ages.

The third quality which social case work has demonstrated as essential to family life is affection. This, of course, is not new; it is the clear, unmistakable pole star which guides the formation of families; and which shines so brightly as children come into them and blossom out into men and women under the hands of their parents. But being so close, possibly its essential nature is not so clear as it might be. Miss Elsa Ueland said at a recent national conference that experience with young girls at Carson College had demonstrated that 'a child would rather live in a home where it belonged, where its elders were concerned about its doings, provoked at its failures, pleased at its successes, even if it were treated with harshness, than to live in a home where it is treated with per-

fect fairness and wisdom, but without affection, without the sense that its success or failure made any difference to its elders.'

As I see it, affection plays two important parts in the home. In the first place it provides the motive which leads parents to make the greatest possible efforts in behalf of their children; in the early years to insure their health, then their education, then their training in the niceties of life. Under no other situation could there be such assurance that the rich heritage of culture in the possession of any one generation would be passed on to the next. The willingness of mother and father to skimp and to save, to toil and struggle that the child may have a chance — these are the social answers to the love we bear our children. But Miss Ueland has pointed out another aspect of affection in the family; it awakens motives in the child himself to make the answering efforts to the parents' teaching. On this point, while we have an abundance of practical evidence, there is almost no scientific analysis or examination of just how or why motive in the child is awakened by the love of his parents. Yet there it stands as the atmosphere of life in which the spirit of the family thrives.

There are probably other qualities or conditions which promote or retard the development of family life; but none, I think, at the present time which can be said to have been made unmistakably clear by social case work. As in so many other aspects of our task, we are but at the beginning of our journey of discovery. We can record what we have seen, mark out the lines for future exploration, but must leave most of the work to be undertaken by our successors.

We do not need to know any more than this, however, to

see the great possibilities inherent in the family. This has been brought out in all the sharper relief by the attitude of criticism and pessimism regarding the family so widely current in press and on platform. When, therefore, Miss Richmond suggested that we celebrate our fiftieth anniversary by a conference which should bring together the best thought we could assemble on the subject of the strengths of family life, it instantly appealed to our member societies. We believed the time had come to stop denouncing the family, or scolding it for its short comings; that it was worthy of better and more careful study than it had yet received; and that our fiftieth anniversary was a good time to say so.

Again, we felt it was opportune to hold such a conference because there is a body of knowledge coming into existence which can throw light upon the question of the modern family, and will, we believe, lead the way for the development of a stronger family life of the future.

May I take a few minutes to point out some of these promising aspects? Biology is breaking away from the fatalistic determinism of Weismann and of the more literal eugenists and giving us a hint of the infinite flexibility of the human mind; telling us that while capacity is fixed at birth, form of conduct which that capacity shall take is apparently entirely undetermined and that we do not really know what capacity itself is. You remember those untold millions of potential neuron terminals and connections which Herrick has written about in his 'Brains of Rats and Men';[1] raw material for literally endless possibilities in habit formation; nothing there but a switchboard; its network of connections to be woven into it by the experience of the individual. If

[1] Pages 3–5.

the human race once could free itself from the shackles of a determinism — religious, economic and biological, to say nothing of the present fad of psychological determinism — a new day of hope would be opened for human beings. Emphasis would swing from human limitations to human possibilities. With the knowledge of the important part which the family plays in weaving the early and therefore the fundamental patterns on that switchboard of habit, the family would come to be seen as something far more important than the happiness or the self-realization of its contracting parties; its function would stand out clearly as the institution by which the child born into it most successfully develops this vast potentiality.

And then has come the concept of social heritage. Recognition of it is not so new as some of us were inclined to think it. But however long or short a time men have recognized it, we are dimly seeing how all of our boasted culture and skills are the slow accumulation of the ages through which men have struggled up from their bestial ancestors. No one generation adds much to it, however much it may be conscious of creating. Compared with what it received from its predecessors, each generation's contribution is very small. Art, literature, philosophy, finance, government, religion, everything which we think of as civilized in contrast with primitive has been created by ancestors, and handed down from generation to generation. No one has ever charted social heritage as Linnæus charted living organisms or the astronomers have counted the stars in the heavens. If for one generation — as Graham Wallas has pointed out, social heritage were to be lost, we should disappear from off the face of the earth within a period measured only by

months. The need for the transference of this invaluable heritage accounts for many of the institutions of society, such as church, school and community; but none of them take just the place of the family in this task. If the next generation is not to be socially cheated, the families of this generation must be strong, well integrated, fully accepting their responsibilities. This gives a positive note to the subject of the family; not very clear, perhaps in its outlines, but sweeping away much of the trash and questionable discussion of the usefulness of the family and placing it upon an impregnable basis. In a literal sense, the family is the conservator and transmitter of the social gains of the ages; without it we should fall back into a state even lower than that of savages.

What I have said up to the present is true of the family in all time and has no particular pertinence to this discussion. The conditions of contemporary society, however, have brought the subject of family behavior into a new prominence. Two world-wide movements have occurred within the recent past which may rightly be called revolutions: one is so called, the Industrial Revolution. Of that, and the stresses which it has placed upon the family, we have heard a good deal at this conference. We are certain to study it more closely, and to neutralize such unfortunate effects as it may create. But of the second, and to me the more important of the two revolutions, little has been said, although it underlies the entire modern world: that is, the rise and growth of the scientific spirit as it results in bringing conduct in line with reason. While in past times the family has varied widely from place to place, and at different periods, yet conformity to a particular form was enforced with fair rigidity in each of them. There are — or were — few social controls

which acted with greater inflexibility, even to the point of severe personal discomfort or death than the controls which enforced sexual and marital conduct. There is a wealth of social evidence on this point which does not need to be brought out; the earliest of our American sociologists, Sumner, emphasized it, as well as almost the latest writer in that same field. This enforcement rested in the hands of impersonal, but none the less real social forces: customs, traditions, religions, systems of morals, public opinion and, to a slight extent, law. Back of them all, however, there rested authority. The prescribed behaviors were enforced because, as was said, they were right. They were not discussed. It was impious to call their validity into question. One who violated their sanctions was ostracized. All of this was highly automatic and fairly uniform. Nor should it be forgotten that even yet, in this field of sex and marital relationships the customs and taboos of society are widely enforced.

But the field of behavior will never again be so largely subject to the arbitrary rule of authority. The scientific spirit has led men to question the basis of all beliefs, as well as of all matter. Almost within the life of this generation reason has taken the place of authority as the guide to behavior. When the reason for sex or marital acts is to be found in their appeal to the individual judgment, it is obvious that people will show less uniformity than when they act in response to vigorous authority. One does not need a profound knowledge of psychology to predict that in such a situation decisions would be very largely made, not in accordance with the abstract merits of the case, but in accordance with desire. A person with any intelligence can usually find a good reason for doing the thing he wants to do. To the first advocates of the rational

basis of ethics, the substitution of reason for authority appeared as the enfranchisement of the human soul. If men were free to create the morality they needed, there was no reason, it was argued, why the millennium should not immediately be ushered in. It is no disservice to reason to point out the fallacy of any such expectations; to point out that while such a result, somewhat modified perhaps, might happen in many individuals, there is nothing contained in such a programme to insure that it would take place universally. If there were time, it would be instructive to follow this road, bordered by authority on one side and reason on the other; to show how reason has ever been contemptuous of authority, looked upon its ideas as superstitious and its customs as accidents, while authority has ever striven to silence the voice of reason.

Far be it from one drilled in the scientific method of approaching questions to throw discredit upon the use of intelligence in this field of human activity. It is enormously superior to the blind government of traditional authority. It contains great promises of future possibilities. But it has not been an unmixed gain. You remember one of the oft-quoted passages from the Bible,

> Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

This is not a particularly clear statement, but whatever its original intent, it has an eloquent lesson here. It says freedom may be gained by finding the truth. Our way has been to place freedom first. The quotation puts truth first, and freedom as a sequence. But when freedom comes first, there is nothing to prevent it from being merely unrestraint, which has neither social nor any other value. Freedom to do as one chooses does not insure that the free spirit will find the truth to guide it. Freedom

which comes from the mastery of a skill, such as freedom to play a piano, is won; it comes only by hard work. Freedom to play the piano, considered merely as lifting the ban against touching it may produce hideous discords. Robert Park described the hobo somewhat along this line; he says in 'The City':[1] 'He [the hobo] has gained his freedom, but he has lost his direction.'

There is another aspect of this pursuit of unrestraint which is equally important for any student of the family; it leads one to undervalue, or totally to disregard, the worth of customs or controls which he does not understand. The present age is contemptuous of its predecessors. In this, incidentally it differs not a whit from these same predecessors; except that the basis of a good deal of its criticisms is the so-called superstitious and formal elements in their lives. Miss Richmond, in her 'The Good Neighbor,'[2] says, 'Civilization drops every now and then some necessary part of its luggage — and has to travel back to pick it up. We have so many houses that we have been forced to rediscover fresh air, and so many cooked dishes that we have been forced to rediscover milk and eggs.' To social science, and to every honest mind, every social custom, or tradition, or religion, or institution has a significance, and that significance is usually to be found in the way it protected some social value: courtesy, kindliness, safety from animals, bacteria or human enemies. I wonder whether the time will ever come when these mores, the crystallizations of the wisdom of the past will be looked upon with the awe, yes the reverence, with which the archæologist looks upon a trilobite. Socially they are just as significant. It does not mean that we should revive the old customs; that would be impos-

[1] Page 158. [2] Page 22.

sible as well as undesirable; but it is tremendously important that we should discover and honor the social value they protected; that we should learn the truths which they have to teach, and then, if we are wise enough, translate them into their modern equivalents.

The family has suffered severely from this neglect of the mores; and the capital crime against its nature has been to regard it as an institution designed, or to be used, for the satisfaction or the self-realization of the man and woman who together begin it. There is no evidence that the happiness or the personal development of the contracting parties was ever valued highly by the social experience which selected the mores of our race. Yet much of the present day literature, especially of the more radical school, is making just that use of our intellectual bursting of bonds of authority: it has assumed, without any inquiry, that the acid test of the family is the degree of happiness it guarantees to its adult members — often to but one of the adult members, and rejects as superstitious all that hinders such a quest.

It is evidence of the toughness of fiber of the family that taken by and large it has so successfully withstood this double threat to its existence — the destruction of its economic function, and the disappearance of its automatic controls before coherent and intelligent substitutes had been worked out. One of the reasons for this success is the persistence of ideals of conduct after the more formal controls have passed. Another is that the change has been gradual, considered from the point of view of a single life span; there is a great deal of control by mores still left; authority continues to dominate the thinking and acts of a large share of contemporary mankind. Witness Fundamentalism. But progress is in the direction

of rational guidance in place of the control of behavior by mores and authority. And it is significant that social work, in the modern sense, came into existence just as we were beginning to make this change; it has had its greatest growth in places where the change has gone farthest; and perhaps it will have its mettle most sharply tested in the future as increasing numbers of men and women throw off the restraints of custom and authority and attempt to substitute their undisciplined wills as guides to conduct. Of course, so long as we are social beings, having all sorts of relations with others like ourselves, and each relation involving its own obligations, determination of what those obligations involve will never be left literally to the judgments of single individuals. The necessity of living together in some sort of harmony will force rules, constraints, laws and duties, which may not be very careful of the individual. Fascism in Italy is a good illustration of this. The saying which expresses the hope of the oppressed, 'When the tale of bricks is doubled, Moses comes,' can be paraphrased with equal pertinence into the statement, 'When individualism threatens social stability, Mussolini comes.'

Here, it seems to me, is the significance of such a conference as this. We are considering the oldest, the most intimate and the most precious of all social institutions. Its task is the preservation of the very soul of mankind. It has gathered to itself all sorts of accidental forms and functions; conformity to its mores has been enforced by sacred traditions and the oldest authority. Much that is accidental about it is changing or falling away. But the need for the family is greater than ever, even as the values it preserves have increased. It is our task, therefore, to know it better, to guide public opinion regarding

its high office, and as Mrs. Fisher said in her paper, to challenge the young people of this age to the great adventure.

Soberly speaking, our task is a twofold one: the first one is fact-finding; to search for the truth, that we may find a real freedom. Social case workers have been the greatest group of fact-finding workers in this field, and possibly will remain such. Social case work is one of the two laboratories of social science. It has never quite learned how to use its great wealth of material in a scientific manner, but that will come. When it arrives, the obligation to make known its findings will accompany it. That, too, is a technique of which our present publicity gives us only hints. But in the very nature of our job, inherent in the concept of case work, the intelligent coöperation of all society is essential to social progress.

The second task is much more difficult — that of forging some sort of controls to act as substitutes for the automatic mores and accepted authority. This is a job for social statesmanship, for it is definitely in what David Adie has called a conflict area. There are always those whose interests are curtailed by any effort to prescribe conduct, and who will therefore oppose such efforts vigorously. The story of our Eighteenth Amendment is an eloquent exhibit of the possibility and the costs of control by one agency alone — the law.

There are two extremes which this task will have to avoid. On the one side there is the danger that the opposition to control will be so vigorous as to postpone its application until a condition bordering on chaos ensues. Our marriage habits, some aspects of business procedures are illustrations of successful resistance to control after

the wisdom of some sort of control has been demonstrated.

The other danger is imminent when the resistance to control is weak, when a clear majority imposes its will upon a small or incoherent minority. Then we get arbitrary and sometimes violently reactionary means: the Baumes law, for instance. In our field, that of the family, we are in greater danger of this latter sort of action; of efforts to restore customs and behaviors of the past; of the use of arbitrary authority of church or social group to enforce behaviors of doubtful social values. We stand in more danger of these arbitrary, unthinking efforts to control behavior in the family field than of any other sort. Such moves only postpone the time when the matter can come into the field of honest discussion out of which only may workable solutions be developed.

And yet when all is said and done, family life is not to be brought to its richest possibilities by mere setting of metes and bounds. Social control carries a negative connotation, barriers erected to prevent members of society from doing certain things. But there is a dynamic aspect in this same field which is far more important. How may the young people of to-day be challenged to want to do that which is socially desirable. That, in reality, is the test of any social programme. It is too late when the wrong desires or habits have been formed. They must be controlled, if they have been allowed to arise. But the hope of an intelligently social society rests in preventing the development of the anti-social habits by the cultivation and promotion of those qualities on which the well-being of social living depends. No one can watch the simple ceremonial of the Camp Fire Girls without realizing the tremendous energies which are available, if they

are but rightly released. All the group programme activities among young people, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Girl Reserves, HiY boys, and many others are fitting places, in these days of transition, to prepare the new generation for a proper conception of family life. They probably hold the key to this important aspect of our subject. The family, itself, in transferring so many of its functions to specialized agencies, will probably have to depend upon such extraneous aids as these to bridge the gap between the period when familiar responsibility was carried as a matter of course, to the time when the family will itself know how to transfer such motives to its own members. One cannot be certain in a matter of this sort. But at any rate, some method must be devised to furnish a never-ending source of inspiration and challenge to the young of every generation, so that the torch of life may be held on high and handed on undimmed to the next generation.

XIV

THE FAMILY WELFARE MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

Mary Willcox Glenn

Half a century should be but a stage in the family welfare movement, if the movement continue to have a definite end in view and to be grounded on sound social principles. Paradoxically, the nature of the movement has been both an evolution and a cult; a cult because it has been sustained by those who have made it the subject of devoted attention and of whole-hearted, simple-minded allegiance; an evolution, because its progression as well as the continuous evaluation of its findings have roots in an historic past.

Zilpha Smith, the leader in the development of the social case work method in the latter part of the nineteenth century, gave in an unpublished address on Joseph Tuckerman the names of six men and a woman each of whom over a period of approximately two centuries made a constructive contribution to the art of helping people. They severally aided their fellows, who suffered under adversity, through stimulating a man's will to be independent of aid by developing his fundamental character — the essence of his personality. These seven were St. Vincent de Paul and Frédéric Ozanam of Paris, Caspar von Voght of Hamburg, Count Rumford of Bavaria (born Benjamin Thompson of Massachusetts), Thomas Chalmers of Glasgow, Octavia Hill of London, and Joseph Tuckerman of Boston. Three of them were clergymen;

one each was a banker, a lawyer, a scientist, an artist. They were a varied group, but their common passion, untarnished by sentimentality, was to help men as individuals. One can borrow Dr. Samuel M. Crothers's characterization of Alice Higgins Lothrop, who was Zilpha Smith's successor as secretary of the Associated Charities of Boston, to define what was the compelling motive that underlay their activity. The motive for them as well as for her was 'the soul of man rather than men in the mass.' Back of these protagonists in an unfolding drama of social endeavor stands the mediæval saint, Francis of Assisi, who had a genius for seeing people divested of conventional trappings, as counting but one each in the eyes of God, and as having worth if they habitually care for one another.

In the foreground here in America is the organization in the late forties and early fifties of the associations for the improvement of the condition of the poor. They, too, derived from our French, German, and English progenitors; but they failed in those early days to hold to the principles of their founders. They became absorbed in the details of relief-giving with no groundwork of experience in administration to guide them. They also lacked a method for the correlation of their experiences or for training the volunteer or salaried members of their staffs. Nevertheless, some few men and women carried over from their personal experience as volunteer members of these earlier associations a conception of the social value of learning to know poor people in their homes. Much as is owed to these several forerunners, the present family welfare societies in America are direct descendants of the London Charity Organisation Society.

Charity organization began in America, as in England,

with the purpose of bringing order into a chaotic field of charitable relief. With that end in view the movement set itself wholeheartedly to the task of being a mediating force. Its aims were to stimulate already established charities to use relief funds for the positive good of those who received aid, and to avoid absorption in almsgiving as a charitable means. But it soon realized that to become an interpreter in a world of charitable chaos it had to begin by being a doer. Only by making the experiment could it prove that there is inherent strength in people to respond to a charitable endeavor which will help them to draw themselves out of disabling poverty. What one should bear in mind is that the founders of the charity organization movement were practical men and women, practical because they were realists and faced squarely the seriousness of their undertaking to keep 'alive the saving health of the family.' They were innovators and they were persistent because they were consecrated to their task. They enlisted because they had vision, and they contributed as men and women of the world both an experience of life and a trained intelligence. They withdrew in a measure from the professional positions for which they had been fitted as lawyers, doctors, ministers, makers of their own homes, in order that they, as friends of all families, might stand together for the institution which of all institutions is 'the oldest and toughest in its fiber,' and that they might prove that the strength of community life rests in the family. It was said, for instance, of one of the pioneer presidents, a brilliant physician, that his society was never out of his mind, that in a sense he devoted all his time to it.

Their concern was not alone with the poor as husbands, wives, sons and daughters, but with them also as belong-

ing to a locality and as affected, therefore, by the conditions which surrounded them. Their belief was that charity should be positive, that it has to do with social efficiency rather than with pauperism. Their point of departure, as Sir Charles Stewart Loch declared, was the people, not their poverty. Their province was to consider a standard of living, not a standard of comfort, for they were jealous lest a poor man's right to conduct his own life with dignity should be lost through thoughtless, sentimental interference on the part of dole givers. It is not fortuitous that a founder, whose visiting in poor homes antedated the organization of the society of which she has been continuously a director, should have had a reprint made of Lord Moulton's 1912 address on 'Law and Manners': 'Manners must include all things which a man should impose upon himself, from duty to good taste,' said Lord Moulton. They have to do with what is unenforceable. In considering both law and manners, he adds: 'I have borne in mind the great motto of William of Wykeham: "*Manners maketh the man.*"'

But the founders of the charity organization movement drew on the teachings of their seven forerunners. The latter, most of whom lived close to the end of the eighteenth century, were true exponents of democracy. Their sense of the value of fraternity had its roots, as with Chalmers, in the recognition of what a neighborhood can do for its members in the way of mutual helpfulness through sharing responsibility. They had, as had Octavia Hill, 'a solemn sense of responsibility.' Their belief in equality made them align themselves neither with rich as rich nor with poor as poor, but with people irrespective of their social status, who had need of their services. They realized that the evils of poverty grow out of the

character of the rich as well as of the poor, and that as oppressors of the poor, the greatest cruelty of the rich is to themselves.

No more glowing tribute could be paid to the power of these forerunners to bring fraternity and equality into a world filled with class distinctions and distrust than that paid in 1915 by Lord Rosebery to Chalmers. 'He warmed Glasgow,' the city he found cold, wealthy, and material. Faith in liberty led them as later it led the founders to have reliance on the character of men. In the 1927 report of one of our societies, the axiom is quoted 'that the noblest charity is to prevent a man from accepting charity and the best alms is to enable a man to dispense with alms.' 'This thought,' the report continues, 'has always persisted as one of the cornerstones of the family welfare movement.' It is the cornerstone because there lies at stake the liberty of the individual to maintain his identity, to develop his innate qualities, in other words to be a personality.

In a private letter written in 1898, Sir Charles Stewart Loch defines what was in the minds of those who laid the groundwork for our social case work in a sound regard for personality: 'I feel more and more the need of what one may call a deeper and fuller analysis of the thought and life of those we would help — not a paper affair but a rich, many-sided conception of them and their possibilities.'

But the followers of the founders in the first half of the history of the movements took from the past a great fear — the fear of the effects of material aid — which put many societies in the way of being negative rather than positive in work. The memory of the abuses of the English system of public subsidies and private doles which

led to the poor law reforms of the 1830's; and a preoccupation with economic theories, such as the law that bad money drives out good, prompted the granting of small, rather than adequate, amounts of relief, on the principle that the less of a poor medium used, the better. The question as to how relief should be raised came to be looked on as a matter of principle rather than of policy. The fact was not grasped that 'perfect administration and foresighted watchfulness,' as Octavia Hill defined it, was the solution of the relief problem thought of in terms of an evil.

Only a few societies discerned the crux of Chalmers's contention that there is an invisible fund, fountains of available aid which inhere in poor people and are their strength as are, also, the helpfulness of relatives, of neighbors, of the parish. These are resources which may be classified as normal. Ill equipped as they were to handle the difficult problems of relief, the societies became vulnerable to critical attack in the optimistic period of preventive philanthropy. Honor be to those staunch practitioners of untutored case work who, during the years when the charity organization movement was said to be negative in outlook and merely remedial in practice, held in mind what is now common property, that prevention cannot be segregated, that it does not belong in a separate compartment of social activity, unrelated to, unaffected by, acts which are experimental and exploratory, remedial and curative. Their first-hand though uninstructed observations of life had taught them that 'no legislative legerdemain will give desired results ready made.' To them Dr. Jung's statement, quoted in the last annual report of the London Charity Organisation Society, would have seemed axiomatic: 'The great

problems of humanity have never been solved by universal laws but always and only by a remodeling of the attitude of the individual.' In some societies, even in the dreariest years of charity organization history, relief was administered discriminatingly and effectively, and the lessons learned were being made a basis for next steps advisedly taken in the practice of inquiry and coöperation. In some societies the tendency was resisted to fit people into tight categories as deserted, widowed, feebleminded, and the like.

With reverence, one thinks of some of those early practitioners of the art of helping, women and men who, without benefit of the schools or of a literature of case work, laid the stepping stones for future advance. It was said of one of them in the nineties that she had 'serious limitations and obstacles to overcome,' but that 'her strong characteristic was her sincere love for her fellow men, which led her to give the best of her life to them cheerfully and in a simple but strong faith.' Others who had more intellectual power were capable of acquiring an organized body of knowledge and of transmitting their correlated experience so that it might become the property of any society. The present social case worker who 'faces the facts, the good ones as well as the bad ones, interprets these facts to the clients and points a path through them to permanent security' is their lineal descendant. So, also, is she who realizing that every case is different behaves 'differently toward each and fills her whole mind with impressions of the person before her in order to see his problem through his mind and with his emotional reaction,' who, moreover, is constantly 'watching for humorous aspects . . . which can produce a smile or laughter.' One likes to recall Zilpha Smith's dictum:

'Looking back from recent experiences, changes of methods often look like reforms. To those who lived through them they seemed rather to be results.'

The stretch of the years presents itself as a loom on which a chronicle is being depicted. The shuttle moves back and forth rendering form and color, on a different scale and with a heightened intensity as subtlety is acquired in the use of appropriate media. But the warp remains the same. What continues to hold its value in our design is the contribution which was made in the first half of our history. The findings of case work were then faced as facts which imposed an obligation on the societies to strive to solve the problems which they disclosed. The going in and out of mean tenements and of unsanitary single-family houses, led to effort made in behalf of better housing. Watching sick people fall victims to tuberculosis in crowded flats resulted in tuberculosis campaigns. Seeing little children in their homes at work on shoddy clothing was an incentive to child labor legislation. Along with legislative work went the effort to educate the public through exhibitions, such as the New York Tenement House Exhibition of 1900, and was followed by a determination to get a fuller knowledge of people's needs through the survey of their living and working conditions, as, for instance, in the Pittsburgh Survey of 1907.

The resolution to be helpful to the whole field of social service and through coöperation to do one's work better, bore such fruit as the confidential (later social service) exchange, the directory of charity, and the various charitable or social reviews. The steady pursuit of right ways to train for service led, through the apprenticeship system, straight to the establishment of the first schools of social work in this country. It is noteworthy that the

first definite appeal for a school should have been made on Canadian soil by Mary E. Richmond and should have found immediate response in the New York Charity Organization Society through the foresight of Edward T. Devine, secretary of the society, and Robert W. deForest, its president.

Throughout the years some societies sedulously practiced what they preached. They held firmly to the principle that their function was to organize charitable forces. If in order to prove that a need existed and to supply a want, they established agencies for temporary shelter and work, for job-finding or for lending or saving money, they saw to it that when practicable these agencies, which they had founded, were taken over by the community to become independent organizations. The genius of the movement for keeping true to its primary function of being a means for the 'fusion and development of diverse personalities into a common usefulness' has never been shown more practically than when the national association of family societies stimulated the development of councils of social agencies, thus surrendering a function which had been its own.

Organization must, however, remain a pivot if the societies are to swing true to their hereditary line of advance, if they are to escape the dangers of narrowing to professionalism or of becoming opportunists. They must continue consciously to direct effort toward bringing order into the field of social relationships, first, through a flexible use of a developing technique, so that families under present care may draw full benefit from the societies' previous social experience and may in turn, vicariously, help those who are later to apply for service. The societies have an obligation to make available the lessons

they have learned from their clients. Second, through a complete sharing of their findings with all others who are practicing the art and are helping to develop social case work as a profession (as, for instance, was done so wholeheartedly through the American Red Cross Home Service during the Great War), and through drawing on the experience of other case work groups, so that the societies may continue to help further the development of case work as a whole. Third, by exercising reticence and showing fuller sympathy in contacts with families so that through serving not alone such as are in need economically but any family which is poor in the ability to adjust its own social life, the democratic purpose of case work may be served. The emphasis placed at present on the first of these requirements, the lesser but definite emphasis on the second, and the growing emphasis on the third, mean that the movement is drawing nearer to the fulfillment of its opportunity.

There is a fourth responsibility not so readily grasped, namely, the responsibility to the community as a whole. Councils of social agencies are meeting the obvious, the easier task of coördinating existing charitable forces and of stimulating the organization of new societies to supply social needs. But untouched at times is the old obligation to deepen the social life of the community through making the mood of charity more common. Such an endeavor, the endeavor to make habitual a right attitude of mind toward one's fellows, calls for more than a technique. In giving, it implies immeasurably more than an increase in sums of money collected from the public as voluntary contributors or as taxpayers. It carries one's thoughts back to the wealth of significance in Chalmers's conception of an invisible fund, available in the com-

munity. It stirs the desire to uncover resources which shall be self-perpetuating. There is no purse that can hold the treasure which the societies must set themselves to find, if through the family welfare movement social case work is to take a creative part in shaping the community of the future.

This leads us, whether we would or not, back to the first half of the old title — charity organization. One is tempted to predict that no matter how far the movement goes, no matter what special emphasis is put at any given time on any particular aspect of progress, a stage will again be reached when thoughtful social workers will recognize that the essential principle which gives spiritual content to social endeavor can be defined in no simpler, more adequate terms than by the word charity. Good wine needs no bush, and a choice word will come again into its own, if the effort to redefine or to enforce its use be not too manifest and if the savor to sample be not lost. The present social emphasis is an objective one, and may advisedly continue to be such for some time to come. But it is well to bear in mind that old habits of thought as well as old words have renewal value. George Russell said recently that though 'thought to-day is concentrated on the external, a return to the subjective is certain.' The family welfare student had best not be in the rear when the turn comes.

May one run a further risk of being classified as reactionary and as failing to recognize adequately the importance of the contribution which psychology and cognate subjects are making to family social work, by quoting Mephistopheles' cynical statement:

> He who would study organic existence,
> First drives out the soul with rigid persistence;

Then the parts in his hand he may hold and class,
But the spiritual link is lost, alas.

In a limited sense it is true that 'the future of social work should be in the hands of social workers.' It is, however, neither wise nor prudent to leave the future of the family welfare movement in the hands of the technically trained. An analogy suggests itself in thinking of such a possibility, which may be drawn between charitable administration, which was almost exclusively within the province of the monastery in the Middle Ages, and social work, to become the function solely of the professional in the mid-twentieth century.

The worker in the family field should push forward persistently and adventurously in the direction of steady improvement in methods of case work; but at the same time the aim, the ambition of each should be to become daily a better interpreter of its whole service. Each society, through its staff and board members, should come to be understood, not merely to be supported, by its own community. Each should become acceptable, which is something more than being accepted. Those who are at work within a society and those who contribute to its support but remain outside its ranks, should keep in step, the latter being drawn continuously closer in thought to the society's true center of energy. Such mobility is proof that a society has been faithful to what peculiarly is a trust, namely, to maintain the principle of using the volunteer as a reservoir of creative energy. Zilpha Smith said that 'some men and women reaching deep down into the larger life seem always full of vigor, always serenely equal to whatever comes to them.' In 'The Rise of the Greek Epic' may be found a complementary statement: 'There is a way of thinking which

destroys and a way which saves,' Gilbert Murray said, and the Greeks defined it by a word which, feebly translated, reads temperance: the temperate in attitude is he who 'walks among the beauties and perils of the world feeling the love, joy, anger and the rest; and through all he has that which saves — whom does it save? Not him only, but, as we would say, the whole situation. It saves the imminent evil from coming to be.'

Serenity, temperance. These are essential marks of a noble personality. They are, moreover, qualities of inestimable value in social work. They may be possessed by professional or by volunteer. But they will not be the possession of a given society unless there is a lively disposition to use in humility many kinds of people to do the work; not unless there is a recognition of the fact that life is the great teacher, that men and women of courage and faith, who have made terms with life should be the finest source-book for the young social worker. To keep company with such human beings offers a young man or woman new to case work an opportunity to be nourished in a social atmosphere which gives a peculiar vigor and imparts a strength which he or she in turn may impart to other men and women in or out of the ranks, whether as clients, fellow workers, or fellow citizens.

The case conference as a method of increasing the understanding of a society's purpose has often been both tedious and haphazard. The principle behind its use is, however, sound. The inadequacy is frequently the result of lack of faith in what the case conference as an assemblage of selected persons can accomplish. No better scheme is available, I believe, for the evaluation of the work than that of bringing staff and volunteers together into an intimacy of discussion of case problems. Nor is there a surer

way of revealing the lacks in family life. The assertion made by Amos G. Warner is as valid now as when he wrote it: 'He who takes an interest in trying to cure poverty in a single case will soon come to find that nothing in politics or industry is foreign to him.'

The family welfare movement has always had the character of a mission. The sharing and the transmitting of experience in the beginning was solely from society to society. From 1880 the National Conference of Charities and Correction (now the National Conference of Social Work) served as a medium of exchange. It was a peculiarly valuable one because of the policy of the Conference to formulate no resolutions. When, at the Toronto Conference in 1897, the proposal was first made that the charity organization societies should form an association, the intention back of the proposal was a missionary one. The appeal was for an extension of living and organic working principles, not merely for an extension of certain methods of work. The history of the successive steps taken over a period of fourteen years to establish the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work cannot be given here. Mary E. Richmond was the leader, with Francis H. McLean beside her throughout the period of gradual consummation of plans. She, with organic principles in mind, gave the motto and emblem of the Conference of Family Life in America To-day: 'Life from hand to hand. Light from age to age.'

The emblem, the torch, implies renewal, for the steadiness and clarity of the light it sheds depend on the strength and purity of the fuel which feeds it. The light is a symbol of sacrifice and suggests that behind the acceptable offering must be the dedicated will.

Bernard Bosanquet of the London Charity Organisa-

tion Society made two statements which may be taken to define the other half of the motto: 'Social progress is the whole solid world of life, breaking out into bud and branches at every point and including while transfusing the growth of previous years,' and 'our task is to find the idea, principle, order, organization at work in the world of facts'; to find those things, so that the movement which began in America fifty years ago with the title of charity organization may do its share in the world's greatest social task — the vitalizing of family life.

THE END

INDEX

(Titles of papers included in this volume are given in italics)

Adie, David C., paper by, 118
Adult education, 127
Affection, 27, 36, 153, 212
Agricultural era, 31, 133
Agriculture, wages of, 84
Allowance, family, 88, 91, 114
Athletics, 145, 178
Attitudes, more important than beliefs, 187
Authority, 217
Automobile, 139, 153

Baseball, 139
Behaviorism, 21, 197
Biological basis of the family, 3–23
Biological Basis of the Family, The, 3
Birth control, 32, 116
Books, number circulated in libraries, 140
Bosanquet, Bernard, 238
Bruno, Frank J., paper by, 208

Canby, Henry Seidel, 179
Career, biological, 3
Case conference, 237
Case work, contribution to modern life, 193; fact-finding, 222; family, 193, 225; industry, 129; project method, 204
Challenge, A, 43
Chalmers, Thomas, 225, 228, 229, 230, 234
Changing Basis of Family Support and Expenditure, The, 102
Charity, 235
Charity organization movement, 225
Child marriage, 62, 63
Children, child labor, 81, 94, 140, 232; child-placing, 210; dependence, 9, 16; differences between oldest, middle, youngest, and only children, 28; effect of industry on, 80; employed, 109; force for permanency in family, 106; home care *vs.* institutional, 106; imitators, 184; individuality, 20; influence of family on, 26; leisure, 140; need stable family life, 210; normal, 52; number among professional people, 66; Parent-Teacher Associations, 176; religious education, 181; social care, 18, 106
Church, 57, 70, 71, 168, 181
Collecting, 153
Community (*see also* Society), aspect of marriage, 61, 65, 66; concern with marriage, 58; controls, 222; industry a part of the, 126; program for education for family life, 57; responsibility of social work to, 234
Compensation, 89, 90
Concern of the Community with Marriage, The, 58
Confidential exchange, 232
Consanguineous unions, 62
Constitutional amendment on marriage, 58, 64
Contribution of Social Case Work to Modern Life, The, 193
Control, dynamic aspects of, 208–24
Councils of social agencies, 233, 234
Courage, 44, 70, 190
Crothers, Samuel M., 226
Cultural inheritance, 24, 49, 56, 215

Dancing, 145, 172
Dependence of offspring, 9 ff., 16
De Schweinitz, Karl, paper by, 133
Desertion, 95, 104
Desires, fundamental, 118, 127
Determinism, 197, 214
Devine, Edward T., 233
Dewey, John, 206
Divorce, 104, 105. *See also* Marriage
Douglas, Paul H., paper by, 102
Dynamic Aspects of Liberty and Control, The, 208

Education, 31, 49, 127, 169, 176, 184
Education for Family Life, 49

Eliot, Frederick May, paper by, 161
Emblem of the Conference on Family Life, 238
Emotional patterns, 30
Environment, 20, 24, 228. *See also* Neighborhood

Fact-finding, 222
Family, affection, 27, 36, 153, 212; agency for passing on social heritage, 25, 215; allowance, 88, 91, 114; aspect of marriage, 61; biological basis of, 3; changes in, 33, 37, 79, 103, 198, 217, 220; changing basis of support and expenditure, 102; complex of attitudes, 201; conflicts, 209; consuming unit, 103; continuity, 211; controls, 222; during agricultural era, 31, 102; education for family life, 49; effect of industrial unrest, 98; effect of women in industry, 80, 88, 93; evolution of, 3, 12, 13, 31; fact-finding about, 222; happiness, 220; home is where family is, 142; home ownership, 90, 140; influence on personality, 26, 34; instability due to industry, 82, 95; insufficient income, 111; integration, 208; integrity of, as a test of industry, 79; leisure, 133; monogamous, 10, 19, 22; neighborhood influences, 161; not self-perpetuating, 50; permanence for good of children, 106, 210; pioneering in family life, 44, 47; polygamous, 8, 16; projects, 204; religion and, 181; roots, 161; size of, 29, 34, 66; success in family life, 208; supplanting by society, 13, 17, 18, 31, 199; temporary, 16; vigorous organism, 200; wage, 84, 87, 112–15
Family and its Neighborhood, The, 161
Family welfare movement, the, 225–39
Family Welfare Movement in America, The, 225
Federal marriage law, 58, 64
Feminism, 6, 72
Fisher, Dorothy Canfield, paper by, 43
Forest, Robert W. de, 233
Freedom, 218
Frost, Robert, 211
Fundamental desires of individual, 118, 127

Games, 152
Glenn, Mary Wilcox, paper by, 225
'Good neighbor,' 165
Groves, Ernest R., paper by, 49

Hamilton, Gordon, paper by, 193
Harrison, H. D., 97
Health movement, 60, 68, 69, 232
Heredity, 20, 24, 27
Hill, Octavia, 225, 230
Home is where the family is, 142
Hoopingarner, D. L., 119
Hospitality, 151
Housing, 90, 140, 232
Howe, Frederic C., 163

Immigrant, 210
Income, insufficient, 111
Industry, accidents, 89; case work in, 129; child labor, 81, 94, 232; conditions in, 91; desiderata, 91; earnings of worker, 1913 and 1918, 124; family allowance, 114; hours of labor, 91, 133, 138; individualization in, 102, 118; Industrial Revolution, 79, 216; insurance, 89–91; integrity of the family as a test of, 79; labor turnover, 94; large-scale production, 119, 120; monotony in, 124, 155, 156; ownership and management by workers, 99, 121; part of the community, 126, 205; participation by worker, 123; safety, 92; self-expression of workers, 100, 118, 121, 155; strain on worker, 86; strikes, 97; Taylor system of efficiency, 120; unrest, 96; vocational guidance, 95; women in, 80, 88, 93, 102
Insects, 13
Instinct, 25, 26
Insurance, social, 89–91
Integrity of the Family as a Test of Industry, The, 79
Intuitions of social work, 194

Jennings, Herbert S., paper by, 3
Jones, Rufus M., paper by, 181
Jung, Dr., 230

Labels, 197
Labor, accidents and casualties, 89; average earnings, 1913 and 1918, 124; child, 81, 94, 232; exploitation by industrialism, 81; hours of, 91, 133, 138; large-scale production, 120; monotony, 124, 155, 156; safety, 92; turnover, 94; unions, 87, 99, 116, 131, 178
Law schools, training for family life in, 54
Leacock, Stephen, 166
Legislation, 58, 63, 71, 88, 114, 129, 232
Leisure, 133
Lewisohn, S. A., 127
Liberty, dynamic aspects of, 208–24
Literature, 182
Loch, Sir Charles Stewart, 228, 229
London Charity Organisation Society, 226
Lothrop, Alice Higgins, 226
Luncheon clubs, 174

Macaulay, Rose, 161
Manners, 228
Marriage, age of, 66, 103; community aspect, 61, 65, 66; community's concern with, 58; compulsion in, 62; consanguineous, 62; early, 62–66; education for, 49; family aspect, 61; fraud in, 62; function of, 11; legislation, 63; minimum marriageable age, 63; modern, 51, 154; monogamous, 10; permanence in, 106, 107; personal aspect, 61; pioneering, 44, 47; premature, 62; proof of age, 64; record, 62; social movement concerning, 67; State aspect, 61
Mating, 5, 11
Matrimonial clinic, 57
McDonald, George, 187
McLean, Francis H., 238
Meditation, 150
Minimum wage, 88, 112
Monogamy, 10, 19, 22
Monotony in industry, 124, 155, 156
More, Sir Thomas, 133
Mothers' pensions, 88. *See also* Family allowance
Moulton, Lord, 228
Moving pictures, 137, 144, 153
Murphy, Prentice, 210
Murray, Gilbert, 237
Muste, A. J., paper by, 79

National Conference of Social Work, 238
Neighborhood, 161, 170, 228
Newspaper, 178, 183
New Tools of Leisure, 133
Normal schools, education for family life, 54

Ogburn, W. F., paper by, 24
Organization, 233, 239
Osler, 197
Ownership and management by employees, 99, 121
Ozanam, Frederic, 225

Parenthood, 49, 51, 106
Parent-Teacher Associations, 176
Park, Robert, 219
Participation of worker in industry, 123
Pensions, mothers', 88
Personal aspect of marriage, 61
Personality, adjustment, 197, 207, 225; development, 229; family and, 26, 34, 56, 202; industry and, 91, 96, 118; neighborhood and, 179; power of, 207; product of habit, 26; social heritage and, 24
Polygamous family, 8, 16
Population increase, 115
Poverty, 238
Press, 178, 183
Project idea in case work, 204
Proof of age for marriage, 64
Public aspect of marriage, 61

Radio, 178
Reason *vs.* authority, 217
Records, case, 74; marriage, 62
Recreation, 31, 33, 100, 133, 185, 224
Relief, 227, 229–31
Religion, 31, 54, 57, 181–90
Religion and Family Life, 181
Reproduction, 4
Rest, 134
Richmond, Mary E., 58, 219, 233, 238
Roots, 161
Rosebery, Lord, 229
Rumford, Count, 225

Saint Francis of Assisi, 226
Saint Vincent de Paul, 225
Saloon, 139, 153
Schools. *See* Education
Schools of social work, 232
Schweinitz, Karl de, 133
Sciences, as leisure activity, 149
Scientific spirit, 178, 216
Smith, Elliott Dunlap, 118
Smith, Zilpha, 225, 231, 236
Social heritage, 24–39, 49, 56, 215
Social Heritage and the Family, 24
Social responsibility, sense of, 178, 228
Social work, contribution to modern life, 193–207; coöperation with labor movement, 101; family welfare movement in America, 225–39; laboratory in, 195, 222; leisure-time activity, 155; part in marriage reform, 74; project idea, 204; techniques of, 202, 233
Socialization, 202, 207
Society, changes, 183; contribution of social case work, 193; customs and taboos, 217, 219; group of families, biologically, 12; home is the unit of, 189; movement concerning marriage, 67; neighborhood, 161; responsibility in industry, 90, 100, 118; supplanting family, 13, 17, 18, 31; transmission of values by, 49, 215
Sociological conception of the family, 56
Song to march to, 43
Standard of living, 84, 111, 116, 228
State allowance for children, 114
State aspect of marriage, 61
State of mind, 43
Strikes, 97

Taylor system of efficiency, 120
Techniques of social work, 202, 233
Temperance, 237
Temporary families, 16
Theological seminaries, training for family life in, 54
Toward the Rediscovery of the Individual in Industry, 118
Tuckerman, Joseph, 225

Ueland, Elsa, 212
Unemployment, 81, 89, 91
Unions, 87, 99, 116, 131, 178

Vocational guidance, 95
Voght, Caspar von, 225
Volunteer, 236

Wages, 84, 87, 112, 116, 124
Warner, Amos G., 238
Webb, Sydney, 98
Whitehead, 207
Women, effect of industry on, 80, 104, 105; leisure of, 141; long working hours in home, 110; minimum wage for, 88; night work, 93; part-time work, 93
Women's organizations, part in marriage reform, 72

Boston Public Library
3 9999 10503 614 7

THE
DRIFTIN

Ernest

'WHOLESOM
Professor C
has take
the most
manuals
have ba
Equ
refre
com
H
hon
bac

LITERATURE, EDUCATION, AND SOCIOLOGY

...Y LIFE TO-DAY

Edited by MARGARET E. RICH

...by foremost authorities constitute a fundamental ...nrichment of family life.

... OF THE MODERN GIRL

...he Education of the Modern Boy.'

... SHERRARD BILLINGS, B.D.

...ve addresses delivered in the

...E

... LOUISE DUDLEY

... freshness, s... truly rema...